THE

# CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXX.] DECEMBER, 1859. [Vol. XV.

## AN UNITARIAN LAYMAN'S EXAMINATION OF THE OPINIONS OF A "NATIONAL" REVIEWER ON THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

IN A LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

Sir,

A correspondent in your last number has well remarked that though the *National Review* has no real claim to be regarded as an organ of the Unitarian body (it would probably itself disown such a supposition), it is not unnaturally, beyond the limits of our own body, regarded as being so, and he proceeds to offer a just and able criticism upon the article on "The Apostolic Age" which appeared in the July number of that Review, the conclusions of which he desires in the name of Christian Unitarianism to disown. A perusal of that article leads me to the conclusion that it has bearings far more important than any impressions, whether erroneous or otherwise, which it may convey elsewhere of the views now or heretofore prevalent amongst us. The belief prevails, and is not, I apprehend, likely to receive contradiction, though I should heartily rejoice at its doing so, that the remarkable article in question is written by a gentleman of most extensive and varied attainments, commanding from the high excellence of his character the warm respect, and, it might almost be said, the affectionate attachment of all who know him, who has been raised, not certainly without opposition or protest, to the highest position amongst English Unitarians, and to whom is especially entrusted the training of those ministers on whom the future welfare of our religious body, and the maintenance and diffusion of the religious principles which we hold to be valuable to ourselves and others, must mainly depend. The general belief as to the authorship of this article found early expression in a notice of the July number of the *National Review* in the *Inquirer*, July 16, 1859, from which I extract the following paragraph: "The gems of the number are the two theological articles, in which most of our readers will detect the well-known style and sentiments of the Professors of Manchester New College, one on the Apostolic Age, founded on Ewald's recent volume on that subject, and the other a review of the controversy between Mr. Mansell and Mr. Maurice on the subject of Revelation." Regarding the authorship of the latter, I have since heard

a different statement; but the allegation as to the article on Ewald I have never heard denied or seriously questioned.

To your readers generally it is a matter of little moment what Ewald may have thought or written upon the subject of the resurrection of Christ. If, indeed, we are to judge of Ewald from the character given of him by his reviewer, it would seem that whatever may be the ingenuity of his theory or the ability with which it is supported, his opinion is not likely to be of any great importance to anybody, since it is pretty clearly insinuated that, whatever may be the motives which influence him, his views rest upon other grounds than deep conscientious conviction or the sincere love of truth. In fact, from the terms in which he speaks of Ewald, we are led to wonder why the reviewer has thought it worth while to lay before his readers any account of Ewald's views at all. In truth, however, while the declared object of the article is to give an account of Ewald's theory, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the theory commands to a large extent the assent of the reviewer's own mind. Hence the weight which the reviewer attaches to the theory, whilst he speaks of its author in terms of no high respect; and hence the importance which attaches to the article as conveying, not the views of Ewald, but the implied sympathy and countenance of the reviewer. It is quite possible, indeed, that this may be denied. There are passages which, taken by themselves, would seem to imply that the reviewer is merely the exponent of the theory of another. The general construction to be placed upon the article, and it is one which I heartily wish that I could myself avoid, is that it represents substantially, if not very distinctly, the views of its author. On this ground alone I attach importance to the article, and have read it with pain and sorrow.

For myself, I can feel, in common I am sure with the great majority of your readers, the deepest respect for those who honestly and conscientiously entertain feelings of unbelief in regard either to the general facts of Christianity or to any particular portion of them. With regard to the reputed author of this article, I am sure that the excellence of his own life, his faithful and assiduous discharge of every Christian duty, and the happiness which is the result and consequence of such a life, render it of little importance as regards himself upon what particular grounds his belief as to the relations in which man stands to God may rest. But I have no belief whatever that to men who have not passed through his long and varied religious experiences, whose lives are necessarily for the most part spent in avocations far removed from the quiet and tranquil pursuit of moral and religious knowledge, the same principle applies in the slightest degree. I have myself learned, from the writings of the ablest men who in bygone days have advocated Unitarian Christianity, to regard the resurrection of Christ as the great

historical proof vouchsafed by God to man of the existence of a future life. I have learned to believe, from observation and experience as well as from early teaching, that upon the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments, conveyed by Christ and attested by his resurrection, hangs the strongest inducement to mankind at large to pursue in this world a virtuous and benevolent life. I was told in early years that until the revelation of a future life was made to mankind through the teaching, death, and resurrection of Christ, although a few learned men had arrived for themselves at a firm belief in the doctrine of immortality, no assured conviction as to a future life existed amongst mankind at large in any such way as materially to influence their general conduct. And the belief thus conveyed to me by others, all the reading of my subsequent life has illustrated and confirmed.

Let us now see how the writer of the article in the *National Review* deals with the resurrection of Christ, hitherto at least the key-stone in the Christian world of belief in the doctrines of Christianity, and let us consider, for the consideration is painfully forced upon us, how far the instructions of the writer of this article, whatever may be our respect for his character, his attainments, or his purity of life, are adapted for the successful training of those who are hereafter to be the ministers of our churches and the instructors of our children,—a position in which, we are bound to add, he was certainly not placed originally by any will or desire of his own. In doing this, I may premise, once for all, that I shall reluctantly use those terms which the subject seems to me to call for, rather than those which my feelings towards the individual would lead me to prefer.

The writer of the able letter in your October number has fully shewn how open the views of Ewald and his reviewer are to a satisfactory reply. As a refutation of Ewald's theory, he leaves little to be wished. He has also indicated, though he has not himself suggested the inference, the strange, though probably unconscious, omission of essential facts, the one-sided arguments, and the defective reasoning, which characterize the article in the *National Review*. The writer of that article holds a position which renders it at least his duty to be acquainted with the arguments on both sides the question, and to state them fully and clearly, not leaving considerations which have an important bearing upon the result to be supplied for him by others. He may despise the theological conclusions of those who have preceded him in the office which he holds; but the calm impartiality which made it a paramount duty to state fully and clearly, without favour or prejudice, every argument on either side, is a point which he would do well to study and to imitate. The reviewer, in fact, possesses a mind remarkably earnest and sincere, but I fear too acute and searching to be eminently comprehensive or just.

Near the commencement of his article, the reviewer says,

"We have always thought it a great mistake to treat Christianity so entirely as an isolated event, a fact altogether *sui generis*, in the course of human affairs."

To treat Christianity as something detached and isolated from the general course of Divine government, may probably be a mistake, but the remark is not new. To treat the introduction of Christianity as the most important event in the history of mankind, I certainly do not admit to be a mistake, and the two things ought not to be confounded. A little further on the reviewer says,

"The distinguished author (Ewald) is led, by the way in which he is conducted to his subject, to take a broader view of it than is often the case. Regarding the entire history of the Hebrew people as a part of the great providential plan for the moral development of the world, he looks on the life of Christ and the apostolic age as necessary links in the chain, which consummate its final result, and deposit it as a new element of vitality and growth in the bosom of the general civilisation of the earth."

I might make some remarks upon the grammar of this paragraph, and observe that if it stood in a school-boy's exercise, the question would very properly be put to him, What is the noun-substantive to which "it" and "its" refer? in other words, what it is that is "deposited as a new element of vitality and growth in the bosom of the general civilisation of the earth"? To this question, two or three possible answers present themselves, but none upon which I am able to fix with any approach to certainty as the true one. My objection to the paragraph, however, is of a far stronger kind. I object to the error—I should rather say, to the unconscious injustice and unfairness—with which the writer assumes, and would lead his readers to suppose, that there is anything *new* in the view here attributed to Ewald, or anything "broader" in the description here given of the connection between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and the relations of both to the general condition of mankind, than good and able men have felt and thought long before the day of Ewald or his reviewer. To magnify the wisdom of our ancestors is an error. To undervalue it is another. To understate it is a more serious one. The reviewer might have known, and must surely have forgotten, how in schools of instruction which were open to himself, the connection between the Jewish and Christian dispensations was dwelt upon and illustrated, and the general condition of the world, at the time when Christ appeared, was stated, amongst other grounds of evidence, as strikingly and beautifully illustrating the manner in which Divine Wisdom had adapted means to ends.

I cannot but wish that the reviewer would take to himself on this subject the words which he applies to Ewald:

"He writes as if he were the first who had caught the true meaning of this history, acknowledging no services from the scholars of a former generation."

I quote what follows for the purpose of declaring my general accordance with the description given of the character of the communications made by Christ to mankind, and in order that my concurrence upon this point may be understood before I proceed to the differences which I must hereafter notice:

"The divine wisdom of Christ himself could not evade the inevitable conditions of all clear and effective utterance. . . . . His discourses and parables, as given in the first three Gospels, are essentially Judaic in their form. . . . . It is not till we have penetrated beneath these mere forms of Jewish belief, which encrust, as it were, the surface of his teachings, that we come to the deeper thoughts, the great universal truths, which underlie them, and which glow through them with all the fervour and intensity of their divine original."

Again the remark is not new, and your readers may perhaps think that some of the "deeper thoughts" and "great universal truths" are not so much "encrusted" as the reviewer's description would indicate, but are, on the contrary, happily obvious to the meanest of mankind. But with this qualification, I am happy to find myself in agreement with the words of the reviewer.

In the passage which follows we are open to the difficulty of whether it expresses the views of Ewald or those of the reviewer. All ordinary forms of interpretation would lead us to suppose the latter. However, a few pages further on comes the distinct statement, "Our object in this paper has been, not to affirm, but simply to state, the views of Ewald on the resurrection." All I can say is, that the general style in which the paper is written, and the terms which the writer uses, render this question one of extreme difficulty. Some portions of the article distinctly state the views of Ewald; others unquestionably express the writer's own opinions, inasmuch as they declare dissent from Ewald. But there is a vast amount of statements, many of them on points of the highest importance, of which it seems impossible to say whether they belong to one class or to the other. The reviewer is probably quite unconscious of the confused obscurity of his own style when treating subjects of this nature. But if he chooses to address the world upon subjects of the highest importance to mankind, he should at least avoid imposing upon his readers the labour of endeavouring to decide whether it is more probable that he is giving them his own thoughts or those of others, particularly as conflicting evidence renders it after all generally impossible to arrive at any certain conclusion. I might even say that this kind of writing is open in practice to far more serious objection. It is not the intention of the writer, but it is the practical result of his style, that he seems to insinuate that which in some instances at least he would undoubtedly disavow.

The mischief in these cases is often far greater than any subsequent disavowal can remedy. Cases have occurred, and probably to a far greater extent than my own knowledge reaches, in which the ambiguous language of the distinguished writer whose name is connected with the article before us, has led to inferences as to his opinions, on the part of those who placed reliance on his character and name, which seemed to be the legitimate interpretation of his words, but which he would himself have indignantly rejected and deeply deplored. The passage now in question is as follows:

"Christ's execution by the hands of Gentiles struck terror into his followers. They found themselves left alone, every hope that they had fondly cherished dashed to the ground; an insulated few, cowed and unprotected in the presence of implacable enemies. All accounts, heathen and Christian, agree that the consequence of this was a temporary lull and suspension of the movement. But it had taken too strong a hold of the deepest feelings of human nature to be annihilated for ever by momentary discomfiture. Hope and trust gradually revived. Mysterious words that had dropped from Christ, and passed unheeded through their ears, seemed now to rise into new significance, and gave another aspect to the faith in which they had lived. *A persuasion had got intense possession of their minds that their Master had risen from the dead, and was spiritually present among them still;* and with this they associated a fervent belief that he would shortly reappear from heaven, to establish in visible power and glory the kingdom for which they looked. At the ensuing festival of Pentecost, associated in the popular tradition with the delivery of their Law from Sinai, these expectations had come to a head, and broke forth in an outburst of rapturous enthusiasm, which may be described as the second birth of the religion. Trust in a glorified and heavenly Christ became now the central thought of the Christian mind, growing out of, blending with, and in part superseding the cherished remembrances of his visible presence and earthly ministry."

This paragraph may represent in the imagination of somebody an accurate description of the events which followed the crucifixion. Indeed, at many points I am far from disputing either the accuracy or the brilliancy of the description. But neither the accuracy nor the brilliancy of the picture prevent my dwelling on what seem to be its omissions. In the words marked in italics, it is quietly assumed that a persuasion had got intense possession of the minds of the followers of Christ that their Master had risen from the dead and was spiritually present amongst them still. Not a word is offered in support of the assumption as to facts which is thus quietly introduced. Whether the thoughts expressed in this paragraph be those of Ewald or of his reviewer, the criticism to which the latter is open will not be very widely different. If, as I would wish to believe, the ideas expressed are those of Ewald, it was surely the duty of his reviewer, if he possessed any fitness for the office which he has undertaken, or any proper sense of the obligations comprised in the duties of a

reviewer, to point out how the views which Ewald has put forth involve the adoption, without a word of proof in the sketch before us, of opinions directly at variance with the early records of Christianity and with the general belief of the Christian world. That these views of Ewald are accepted by his reviewer I should hardly suppose. I think it more probable that he may be in a state of doubt and uncertainty respecting them. I am constrained to think, however, that the way in which he passes them over without remark perhaps indicates a considerable amount of sympathy on his own part. But if at any point I should misconceive him, I can only declare that he is himself responsible for any such misconception by failing to express himself in plain and intelligible language. That the resurrection of Christ was a belief arising in the minds of his followers, unsupported by any actual resurrection, is in fact what is assumed, without a word of proof or comment, in the foregoing paragraph.

Further on, it is said,

"Ewald has some views of his own respecting certain parts of Paul's character and history which are ingenious and suggestive, but which he affirms with a positiveness out of all proportion to any evidence adduced."

From this I have no inclination to dissent. But the reviewer goes on to say,

"More reason and value attach, in our judgment, to some other of his suggestions: that Paul was converted and made a new man by the contemplation of the risen Christ."

Does the reviewer really mean to treat as a suggestion of Ewald's what may be supposed to be an idea familiar to every man, woman, and child, who has learned to read the Bible? If this be not his meaning, I am unable to make out any other which his words convey.

The reviewer then proceeds to describe in the following striking terms the state of things which prevailed after the death of Christ:

"In the book of Acts and in the Pauline epistles, the most superficial reader must be struck with the fact, that the grand idea, the spiritual atmosphere, as it were, pervading these writings, is not the remembrance of a departed and earthly teacher, but the belief in a present and heavenly Lord. . . . . If any thing is clear in the writings of Paul (and no writings breathe an intenser spirit of conviction), it is that he firmly believed in Christ as a divine personage who was the head of a new dispensation, a medium of access to the invisible God, the source from which God's Spirit was immediately effused on the hearts of believers. . . . . The temporal was absorbed in the eternal. Riches, pleasures, worldly distinctions, family ties, and social relations, were renounced unhesitatingly for an invisible reality which only faith could grasp. Earlier and contemporary records of the workings of the human spirit show nothing like this."

And he then goes on to say,

"Again, the question forces itself upon us, Whence could so intense a conviction of things unseen originate? The obvious answer is, From a belief in the resurrection of Christ, and his uninterrupted spiritual presence with his disciples."

How this belief arose is the main point at issue.

My answer would be as follows. Of course there is no novelty in the answer, but everything which has previously been written upon the question seems to be quietly ignored by the reviewer, a matter of little moment to those who are already familiar with the subject, but unfortunate for those who may trust to him for instruction and guidance. The belief arose from an entire conviction, in the minds of those who had been nearest to Christ during his life upon earth and at the period of his crucifixion, that he had been miraculously raised from the dead,—a fact so well attested by the evidence of trustworthy witnesses and the general publicity of the facts, as to command at the time an acceptance which can be accounted for on no other probable supposition than that the alleged miracle was true. A belief in the divine origin of Christianity rests at the present day, so far as this part of the argument is concerned, not upon any miraculous facts within the knowledge of each of us, which would amount to a departure from the ordinary course of nature at all periods and in all parts of the world, so as to bring the actual knowledge of miracles within the reach of all men, but upon the fact, which is as historically certain as any other fact in the past history of the world is or can be, that the resurrection of Christ was believed by those who, living at the time and being present upon the spot, had the best means of judging of its truth; that the attestation of the fact was such as to produce a rapid and general belief in its having taken place, and a consequent widely extended acceptance of the doctrines of Christianity throughout the civilized world; and that the state of things which then arose and still exists amongst us is one incapable of being accounted for upon any supposition of imposture or delusion on the part of the followers of Christ, as either one or the other would certainly encounter in its own day that searching scrutiny which every pretended miracle has undergone, and which no pretended miracle has ever been able to resist.

Let us now see how this question is dealt with by the reviewer. He first remarks,

"There is far more variation and uncertainty in the private views of thoughtful and religious men on this subject than is openly avowed; and it is high time that this disingenuous reserve should be broken through, and for the sake of the highest and most solemn truth, that the differences of opinion which really exist should be candidly admitted and freely discussed."

And then proceeds to give us what he distinctly specifies as the view of Ewald:

"He thinks that the interment in Joseph of Arimathea's tomb was only temporary, that some of the disciples would naturally claim the corpse, as those of the Baptist did their master's (Mark vi. 29), and that they actually deposited it in another grave in Galilee; that the discovery of the abandoned grave was the outward occasion and stimulus of a general realising among the disciples of the spiritual presence of their risen Lord as they had known him, seen him, and heard him on earth; that there was a spiritual resurrection of him in the hearts of his followers; and that this was a result of the intense impression of Christ's person and working on earth, only that they viewed him now, after his resurrection, not as a merely resuscitated man, but as a superhuman being and only Son of God, the reflection in his glorified state of him whom they had known in his terrestrial state as the Messiah. He considers John's the most complete account of the resurrection, and remarks in a note, that this disciple believed in the fact without any visible appearance. Of such visible manifestations he observes that John gives only a few specimens; and that the narratives contained in the supplementary chapter xxi. fall into four sections, in which the sensible appearances assume successively a steady increase of distinctness; and that Christ was most distinctly seen in Galilee. It was only believers who saw him after his resurrection, Paul's being an exceptional case. Ewald compares the Christophanies of the New Testament with the Theophanies of the Old, and regards the visions of Paul and the Apocalypse of John as only fainter examples of the same class of phenomena with the resurrection of Christ. As God under the old dispensation revealed Himself to men of God, so Christ under the new only to the converted and believing: and in both cases it was only at the commencement of the respective dispensations that such appearances occurred; they gradually became rarer and fainter, and at length ceased altogether. He has noticed that in Luke, c. xxiv., these manifestations are limited to the Sunday of the resurrection; though the same author, in Acts i., afterwards gives them a wider range."

The reviewer then goes on to say,

"But Christ's manifestation to believers only, his complete evasion of the notice of all others to whom his person must have been perfectly familiar both in Jerusalem and in Galilee, his sudden presence and mysterious disappearance on several recorded occasions, and the difficulty which attaches to every imaginable conception of the ascension, leave on the mind, in spite of several passages which are evidently intended to produce an opposite effect, a somewhat dim and vague, but nevertheless an almost irresistible impression, that we are here dealing with something different from the corporeal frame in which Jesus of Nazareth had once lived, and which a few days previously had been deposited in the grave."

Here again, in the expressions, "manifestation to believers only," "complete evasion of the notice of others," the reviewer quietly assumes as a fact what is neither proved nor admitted.* What is of more moment, however, is to endeavour to learn from the preceding extract and those which follow what is the

* See Christian Reformer for October, p. 583.

reviewer's own judgment as to Ewald's opinion. After declaring, as I have already noticed, that "our object in this paper has been, not to affirm, but simply to state, the views of Ewald on the resurrection," he goes on with what we can only understand, from the terms used, to be the declaration of his own feelings:

"Taking the words of the gospels in their obvious, unforced sense, difficulties attach to the subject from whichever side we look at it. Was it an actual restoration of former flesh and blood from the grave, acting as matter on matter through the ordinary avenues of sense, and exercising all the usual functions of a corporeal existence? or was it the manifestation of a spiritual reality from the unseen world, conveying to the minds which discerned it, in some way at present inexplicable by us, a certain proof of the continued existence of a person recently deceased? No one has a right to claim for either of these views the merit of exclusive rationality or credibility. . . . . To us it has always appeared surprising that so much stress should be laid by religious men on the fact of the *bodily* resurrection of Christ, as the only solid ground of belief in a life after death. . . . . What we want is, not testimony to a restored life in *this* world (which has no bearing that we can see on the sublimest of human expectations), but direct evidence, if it can be got, of uninterrupted personal existence in the invisible state which lies *beyond* this world."

These extracts, and others which might be added, seem to indicate, not the reviewer's acceptance of Ewald's theory, but a large amount of sympathy with it. Upon this theory I shall proceed to make a few brief remarks, but before doing so I feel called upon to notice one passage in the words of the reviewer. He says,

"We are well aware what an outcry against mysticism and weak credulity will be raised in some quarters, and of infidelity in others, on the mere suggestion of such an hypothesis as this. But they who so rigidly insist on their own view of physical miracle, have no special warrant for requiring others, who acknowledge the presence and the direct operation of the living God in all things, to limit the divine communications to the *body*, and to exclude them, with equal evidence of certainty, from the *mind*, of man."

I must be allowed to say that these expressions are not consistent either with courtesy or fairness. What right has the reviewer thus to stigmatize the opinions of those who may happen to differ from him, or to describe the expression of those opinions as "outcry"? In theology, as in politics, there is a school which is apt to regard all liberality as well as all wisdom as concentrated in itself, and to this school the words I have quoted would seem to indicate that the reviewer belongs.

Disregarding, therefore, the construction which the reviewer has thought fit by anticipation to place upon what I may say, I shall proceed to remark upon the views which have been given of Ewald's theory, leaving the question open how far the quotations I have given imply accordance of feeling on the part of

the reviewer with the essential points of Ewald's theory. That theory in substance is, that the resurrection of Christ was not a resurrection of the body, as recorded in the gospel narratives, but that the body of Christ was privately removed and buried by his friends, and that the subsequent appearances of Christ to his disciples were spiritual appearances in his likeness. May I upon this subject quote the remark made to me by a friend? "In other words," he said, "the advocates of this theory impute to the Almighty the attempt to impose upon mankind by false appearances." I suppose that Ewald and his reviewer consider that it was reserved for their superior penetration, after the lapse of eighteen centuries, to detect the imposition.

As the reviewer gives no statement of Ewald's arguments in support of his theory, it would be out of place here to seek to reply to them. But upon the general question I may remark, that neither the reviewer nor Ewald appears to doubt that Christ appeared to, and conversed with, his disciples after his death. On the contrary, I understand them distinctly to admit this. Now I can understand the feeling of inability to accept the force or conclusiveness of evidence as to any departure from the order of nature having taken place nearly two thousand years ago. But the reviewer has, I believe, declared in distinct terms his admission of the supernatural, that is the miraculous, character of events which accompanied the introduction of Christianity. The objection of the reviewer, as I understand it, is not to the fact of the re-appearance of Christ in this world after death, or of his holding conversation with his disciples, but to the restored vitality of his body, which seems to present to the mind of the reviewer doubts and difficulties in which the spiritual re-appearance of Christ has no share. Granting the miracle, I must own myself quite unable to feel greater difficulty in the one than in the other. The admission of a miracle requires, I admit, powerful evidence. But I can feel no stronger hesitation in admitting the bodily resurrection of Christ than the appearance of a spiritual form, exercising the functions of bodily existence, to the extent even of the utterance of words. To me, indeed, the former supposition appears the simpler and more natural one. That, however, is not the real question. I believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ, because I believe that it is what the gospel narratives attest. The reviewer remarks,

"We have known persons whose faith in another life was based professedly on their belief in the bodily resurrection of Christ, possessed by doubts and fears unknown to those whose faith had a deeper and more spiritual source, and anxious to find some broader ground for a hope which they had been taught could only rest with security on this special and insulated fact."

My own faith certainly does not rest, nor was I ever taught that it should rest, upon the bodily resurrection of Christ, to

the exclusion of other grounds of belief. I have studied as I best could the various evidences of Christianity, and I dwell upon them as a consistent whole. I believe in the resurrection of Christ as recorded in the Gospels because that is the view which evidence appears to me to support. To me the adoption of Ewald's views would not be, as indicated by the reviewer in the paragraph just quoted, the removal or the lightening of difficulties. Its effect upon my mind, if I could regard it as either wholly or partially supported by fact, would be widely different. If I could regard the theory of Ewald as probable, involving, as that theory does, the assumption that the gospel narratives are in important particulars false,—that the removal of the body of Christ from the tomb took place by the hands of his disciples and not by the interposition of God,—that the companions of his life and the chosen agents and instruments of his mission were parties to a base imposition,—the effect upon my own feelings would be, not, by the removal of a supposed doubtful portion of miraculous interposition, to give, as the reviewer intimates, strength and force to a belief in the remainder, but by shewing that the introduction of Christianity to mankind was overshadowed by discreditable circumstances, and that the disciples of Christ were mistaken in half the belief they entertained of the miraculous evidences of his mission, to destroy all faith on my part in any belief of theirs in the remainder. The evidence of miraculous interposition, as I have already remarked, rests in no slight degree with succeeding generations upon the existence of historical proof that such interposition was accepted and believed, after full and searching inquiry, by the generation which witnessed it.

One other passage I must notice. The reviewer says,

"The fact itself, granting it all the religious significance which is claimed for it, is still open to the construction which some men have put, and will put, on it, and which we have no right to say they do not honestly put on it,—that the death was only an apparent one, succeeded by a return of suspended animation: and the possibility of the entertainment of such a supposition by earnest and intelligent men is sufficient to deprive the fact of that character of certainty which alone renders it of value to the end which it is supposed to subserve."

The latter part of this paragraph is another instance, in addition to others which have been noticed before, of the quiet assumption by the reviewer of what is neither proved nor admitted. By such processes anything may be proved *in appearance*. In the case before us, I can only say that my own view is in direct opposition to that of the reviewer. No two minds in the human species are constituted exactly alike, any more than any two forms of the human countenance. Different kinds of evidence affect different minds in different ways. The reviewer assumes that evidence which is not satisfactory to all earnest and

intelligent men is of no value whatever. According to the constitution which God has given to the human race, I take the question of the authority of evidence to depend, not upon its being accepted by every mind, but upon its being satisfactory to honest and intelligent men in general.

I have dwelt upon the article which forms the subject of this letter, not certainly from any merit which belongs to the article itself, but from the importance justly attaching to the character and position of its reputed author. In so doing I have discharged a painful, but in my eyes an imperative duty. I have seen with surprise and sorrow the unwarrantable assumptions, the arguments strained, as it seems to me, beyond all due proportions, the palpable omissions, the doubtful inferences, which I have endeavoured to indicate, and of which your readers may judge for themselves. Intentional unfairness in argument I have never for one moment thought of imputing to the excellent person who is the subject of my present remarks. Rejecting, as distinctly as words can do, any such imputation, I am driven to the other supposition, that he possesses a mind of great ability, but singularly unfitted, by its natural constitution, and by the absence of what may be called the judicial faculty, for the pursuit and discovery of truth,—most especially unfitted for the important duty of training others in the conduct of theological investigation. I say this with the fullest acknowledgment of his great and varied attainments, of his many virtues, and with the testimony, which I gladly and gratefully bear, that no man more fully understands or better teaches the spirit of practical Christianity. With regard to the question which he has now introduced to the notice of English readers with a degree of sympathy which I believe to be wholly unsupported by proof or by valid argument, it appears to me that, granting as he grants the great question of miraculous interposition in authentication of Christianity, the inquiry he raises is, even upon his own view of its character, rather a matter of unprofitable metaphysical speculation than one upon which wise men would seriously occupy their time and thoughts. Thus far I might perhaps go with the reviewer—that if the gospel narratives recorded not the resurrection of Christ from the tomb, but the simple facts of his appearances to his disciples after death, the evidences of Christianity might not to many minds be very much weaker, though I think they would be weaker, than they are now. But I have felt called upon to resist in your pages the acceptance of Ewald's theory on the resurrection, and to expose, as far as my ability extends, what I feel to be the weakness and the inconsistency of that theory as stated in the pages of the *National Review*, not because I attach to the bodily resurrection of Christ the exclusive importance which the reviewer supposes in some quarters to exist, but because I regard it as a

fact which the gospel narratives faithfully record, and feel that the admission of the principles which Ewald's theory involves would weaken the grounds of my own belief of divine interference in authentication of Christianity.

One remark more, and I have done. The last words of the reviewer are,

"Christianity will then resume its apostolic fervour and simplicity when, going back to the original fountains of faith in the human soul, and renouncing the fruitless controversy about forms of opinion, which derive all their value from the intellectual needs of different minds, it shall throw itself once more, without distrust or reservation, on that eternal religion of the heart and conscience which is the utterance of God's Spirit within us, which Christ once acted out in all its fullness in the narrow circle of Palestinian life, and which his followers, believing in the perpetuity of his heavenly life, have been striving, for nigh two thousand years, with various success, to spread over the world."

In this, as in many other instances, I wish that the reviewer would more exactly define his meaning. With much that is beautiful in idea and expression, there is in these words a vague generality which leaves it extremely difficult to make out how much or how little the writer intended them to convey. A construction to which the words seem legitimately open is, that we are to throw ourselves back, without distrust or reservation, on that eternal religion of the heart and conscience which is the utterance of God's spirit within us. In some senses there is nothing in the passage before us to which I or any believer in Christianity would object; but if it is intended by these words to intimate (and if it be not, I am unable to make out any definite meaning attaching to them) that, abandoning as unimportant and insufficient any historical evidence of the divine introduction of Christianity, we should throw ourselves upon the eternal religion of the heart and conscience, then I must dissent entirely and emphatically from the views thus expressed. Men whose lot has enabled them to spend their lives mainly in the investigation of religious subjects and the study and contemplation of the moral aspects of Christianity, may, like the reviewer, find their strongest grounds of faith in its internal evidences. I have no quarrel with them for doing so. But it would be a fatal mistake to consider such principles as applicable to society at large, constituted as society is by the Divine Author of the universe.

I have already touched, in an earlier part of this letter, upon the aspects of society in earlier times which seem to indicate the value of a special revelation from God to man. In the truth of that revelation I believe. In its inestimable value to society I believe no less. I further believe in the duty of defending, as far as an individual may, the authority and influence of the communications which God vouchsafed to make to man through

Christ. The divine authority of those communications it seems to me to be the tendency of the reviewer, though it may be far from his intention, to undervalue, to understate and to injure. If the views which he shadows forth are admitted and extended to their legitimate consequences, if the doctrines and the teachings of Christ are reduced to the level of the reasonings of Socrates or the speculations of Plato, the result will be to weaken the superiority which God has given to modern religion over ancient philosophy, to Christian civilization over Heathen sensualism, and to impair the influence of those blessings to mankind which God conveyed to them by his Son and attested by supernatural authority.

The subject has led me on to a length which I little anticipated. For this I must apologize to your readers and yourself, and now subscribe myself,

AN UNITARIAN LAYMAN.

*Buxton, Oct.* 14, 1859.

---

## SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

### No. V.

"And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at the eventide" (Gen. xxiv. 63).

"AND he went out to meditate
At eventide"—discourse to hold
With fleeting things of earthly state,
And heavenly splendours manifold.

"And he went out" to solitudes
Far from the world's encumberings;
And there, midst wilds and wastes and woods,
He mused unutterable things.

"To meditate" on mysteries
Of angels and angelic souls,
In their own paradise of bliss
Where all God's glory round them rolls.

"At eventide"—when sinks the sun
At the sweet vesper twilight's close,
On labours o'er and duties done,
Bearing the soul to its repose.

So, like the patriarch, be it mine
  In solitude and silence, far
From earth, to think of joys divine
  Around, beyond the farthest star.

And thus immortal rays to blend
  With mortal gloom,—and, led by love,
Celestial ladders to ascend
  Into heaven's brightest courts above.

No. VI.

"Rejoice with trembling" (Ps. ii. 11).

"Rejoice with trembling"—yet rejoice,
  For in the stillness of the soul
A voice is audible,—a voice
  No will can silence or control;
And this its language: Mortal, here
Tears have their joy, and joys their tear.

"Rejoice with trembling," for all joy
  Is grief's twin brother, and where'er
Heaven may shine brightest, the annoy
  Of earthly darkness will be near:
All mortal things are steep'd in gloom,
And glory's goal is but the tomb.

"Rejoice with trembling," for the hold
  On earthly things is broken soon,
And all that's young will soon grow old,
  And life is changeful as the moon:
Joy is a dream and life a span,
A shadow of a shadow—man.

## AMERICAN SLAVERY.

### A LETTER TO REV. R. BROOK ASPLAND.

Dear Sir,

With great interest I listened on Tuesday, the 11th inst., at your chapel, and on Friday last at Lady Huntingdon's chapel, Spa Fields, to the eloquent but not wholly satisfactory addresses of the Rev. S. J. May, of Syracuse, U.S. Every friend of humanity must listen reverently to a history, from such lips, of the long struggle (still, alas! incomplete) which is to give freedom to four millions of our coloured brethren. Can any thoughtful listener help wishing to comply with your friend's earnest appeal for co-operation, and to contribute what in him lies towards the speedy and safe accomplishment of an object important indeed to the slaves, and perhaps not less important to the large class which comprises their masters and their masters' families? The subject is a vast one, and different minds cannot but see it from different points of view. One aspect, and the only one I can presume to deal with, is the legal and chronological view of what has passed in England.

Even if it be true that the origin of slavery in the United States was in some sense derived from this country, and that for two centuries or more before the labours of Clarkson and Wilberforce obtained their first Parliamentary success in 1806, the English had a large share in the foul disgrace of the Slave-trade, still it ought to be borne in mind that during all this time slavery formed no part of the English Constitution. It seems to be a well-authenticated fact that in the eleventh year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, one Cartwright having brought a slave from Russia to England, and being questioned for scourging him here, it was resolved that England was too pure an air for a slave to breathe in.

In 1695, an action* was brought in England for forcibly taking a negro claimed by the plaintiff as his property. On the trial a special verdict was found to the effect that the father of the plaintiff was possessed of this negro and of a manor in Barbadoes, and that there is a law in that country which makes the negro part of the real estate; that the father died seized, whereby the manor descended to the plaintiff as son and heir, and that he endowed his mother of this negro and of a third part of the manor; that the mother re-married, and her second husband brought the negro to England; that both the plaintiff's mother and step-father were dead, and that the negro continued several years in England. After argument at the bar several times, it was adjudged by Lord Chief Justice Holt and the other Judges of the Court of King's Bench, that this action would not lie, that trespass would lie for taking an apprentice or an heir-appa-

* *Chamberlain* v. *Harvey*. Lord Raymond's Reports, Vol. I. p. 147. Carthew's Reports, p. 396.

rent, that an abbot might maintain trespass for his monk, and any man might maintain trespass for another, if he claimed for the loss of his services, but that it would not lie in this case, because a negro cannot be demanded as a chattel, neither can his price be recovered in damages in an action of trespass as in case of a chattel, for he is no other than a slavish servant, and the master can maintain no other action of trespass for taking his servant, but only such which concludes per quod servitium amisit, in which the master shall recover the loss of his service and not for the value or for any damages done to the servant.

In 1706, the language of Lord Chief Justice Holt and the other Judges then sitting in the Court of Queen's Bench,* was, "There is no such thing as a slave by the law of England," and they decided that an action does not lie for a negro any more than for any other man; "for," said they, "the common law takes no notice of negroes being different from other men." By the common law no man can have a property in another except in special cases. The same great Judge (in an action to recover £20, the price of a negro sold by the plaintiff to the defendant in London) held† "that as soon as a negro comes into England he becomes free. One may be a villein in England, but not a slave." Mr. Justice Powell said, "In a villein the owner has a property, but it is an inheritance. In a ward he has a property, but it is a chattel real. The law took no notice of a negro." Lord Chief Justice Holt added, "You should have averred in the declaration that the sale was" of a slave "in Virginia, and that by the laws of that country negroes are saleable, for the laws of England do not extend to Virginia, being a conquered country. Their law is what the king pleases, and we cannot take notice of it but as set forth; therefore he directed the plaintiff should amend, and that declaration should be made that the defendant was indebted to the plaintiff for a negro sold here at London, but that the said negro at the time of sale was in Virginia, and that negroes by the laws and statutes of Virginia are saleable as chattels." Then the Attorney-General coming in said they were inheritances, and transferable by deed and not without, and nothing was done.

In 1762, Lord Chancellor Northington‡ used these words: "As soon as a man sets foot on English ground he is free; a negro may maintain an action against his master for ill usage, and may have a Habeas Corpus if restrained of his liberty." Ten years later occurred the case of James Somerset§ the African, who had been bought as a slave and brought from Virginia to

* *Smith* v. *Gould.* Lord Raymond's Reports, Vol. II. p. 1274.

† *Smith* v. *Brown* and *Cooper.* Salkeld's Reports, Vol. II. p. 666; Holt, p. 495.

‡ *Shanley* v. *Harvey.* Eden's Reports, 126.

§ *Somerset* v. *Stewart.* Lofft's Reports, pp. 1—19. State Trials, Vol. XX. pp. 1—82.

England by his master, and was here forcibly placed by his master on board a ship to be taken to Jamaica and sold there; but he claimed his freedom, and was brought up under a writ of Habeas Corpus, and after a most elaborate and celebrated argument in the Court of King's Bench in May, 1772, the great Lord Mansfield delivered the unanimous judgment of the court for his immediate discharge. Among other observations, he is reported to have said, "The power of a master over his slave has been extremely different in different countries. The state of slavery is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons moral or political, but only positive law, which preserves its force long after the reasons, occasion, and time itself from whence it was created are erased from memory. It is so odious that nothing can be suffered to support it but positive law; whatever inconveniences, therefore, may follow from our decision, I cannot say this case is allowed or approved by the law of England, and therefore the black must be discharged." The Lord Chief Justice's concluding words are reported as follows: "Villeinage, when it did exist in this country, differed in many particulars from West-India slavery. The lord never could have thrown his villein, whether regardant or in gross, into chains, or sent him to the West Indies and sold him there to work in a mine or in a cane-field. At any rate, villeinage has ceased in England and it cannot be revived. The air of England has long been too pure for a slave, and every man is free who breathes it. Every man who comes into England is entitled to the protection of English law, whatever oppression he may heretofore have suffered, and whatever may be the colour of his skin. 'Quamvis ille niger, quamvis tu candidus esses.'"

Great and manifold as were the differences between villeinage in England and slavery as it existed in our West Indies, it may be sufficient here to notice this one. When a free man married a "nief" (i.e. a female villein) their children were free—nay, she herself during the coverture was free, and if it was her own lord who married her, her villeinage was not only suspended during the coverture, but she was for ever free. So that the thrilling case mentioned by Mr. May of the anti-slavery farmer from the Free States being compelled, as his brother's executor, to sell his brother's widow and accomplished daughters (almost white) to satisfy heartless creditors, is one of the sad facts in America which never could have been true in England.

The decisions above referred to of the English Courts of Law were followed by the strenuous exertions of the Society for the Abolition of the Slave-trade, and the traders became alarmed. In 1789, the manufacturers of Sheffield were noble enough to present a petition to Parliament stating that they were greatly interested in the continuance of the Slave-trade, but praying that their interests might be disregarded and the trade abolished at

whatever sacrifice. A few days later, Wilberforce moved in the House of Commons for the total and immediate abolition of the Slave-trade. He and his friends desired to transfer from this country the guilt of so abominable a traffic; even if, as some of them feared, they should give no relief to the negroes. Pitt, Fox, Burke and Grenville, vied with one another who should express in the strongest terms his detestation of the trade. Then followed a full investigation before the Privy Council of the facts of the traffic. Dreadful as these disclosures were, and convinced by them as many were that neither the trade, nor even slavery in the islands, could exist for many years longer, still the House of Commons, on April 19, 1791, incurred the disgrace of refusing, by a majority of nearly 2 to 1 (163 to 88), to give Wilberforce leave to bring in a bill to prevent the further importation of slaves into the British colonies in the West Indies. However, the very next year the House resolved that the trade should be abolished from Jan. 1, 1796; but the House of Lords determined on the delay of examining witnesses before they would concur in this resolution, and so nothing was done for many years in Parliament.

In Barbadoes, several instances of very cruel murders of slaves occurred while Lord Seaforth was Governor of that island. He was shocked to find that the murder of a slave was only punishable with a fine of about £11, and he endeavoured to procure an alteration of the law. But the Legislative Assembly resisted him and did nothing till 1805, when they passed a law which was represented as punishing with death the murder of a slave; and for at least ten years they had credit for this act of justice and humanity; till in 1816 the laws passed in the West Indies for the protection of slaves came to be printed, and then it turned out that the terms of this Act of Assembly passed in 1805 were, that if any man should *wantonly and without provocation* murder a slave he should suffer death.

Fox's short administration had the satisfaction of passing two Acts of Parliament in one year, 46 Geo. III., ch. 52, prohibiting the Colonial Slave-trade, and ch. 119, checking the African Slave-trade. These were followed by a third Act the next year, 47 Geo. III., Sess. 1, ch. 36, abolishing the African Slave-trade.

In spite of these Acts, the Slave-trade was still carried on to a considerable extent. In order more effectually to suppress it, Brougham's bill was brought in (March 5, 1811) to make the dealing in slaves or fitting out vessels for that purpose a felony. The Act 51 Geo. III., ch. 23, passed through both Houses without opposition.

In Jan. 1812, Wilberforce, Romilly, Brougham, Stephen and Babington, met to consider what measures it would be necessary to take to make effectual the Act for the abolition of the Slave-trade. The most effectual measure appeared to them to be the

establishing a registry for slaves in all the islands, and a law that every negro not registered should be free, and it was determined that an attempt should be made to procure an Act of Parliament for that purpose. For seven or eight years, however, their labours were unsuccessful.

In 1814, they were cruelly disappointed to find that the treaty of peace with France did no more than acknowledge the Slave-trade to be repugnant to principles of natural justice and to the enlightened times in which they lived, and engage the King of France to unite all his efforts to those of his Britannic Majesty at the approaching Congress, to induce all the powers of Christendom to decree the abolition of that trade, so that it should cease universally; and that it should cease definitively under any circumstances on the part of the French Government in the course of five years, and that during that period no slave merchant should import or sell slaves except in the colonies of the state of which he was a subject. However, a crowded meeting was held at Freemasons' Tavern, June 17, 1814, to petition Parliament against the Slave-trade. The example was followed in most of the great towns of England, and more than 800 petitions were in little more than a month from this time presented to Parliament against the Slave-trade, signed by above 750,000 persons. Some discussion followed in both Houses of Parliament.

In the next year, Parliamentary discussion took place on the conduct of General Ainslie as Governor of Grenada, and afterwards as Governor of Dominica, and his treatment of maroons or fugitive blacks.

In the same year (1815), Wilberforce yielded to the pressure of the African Institution, and moved for leave to bring in a bill for establishing a registry of slaves in the plantations. Romilly supported the motion on the ground that the registry was proposed not merely as supplementary to the abolition, and as giving complete effect to that measure by rendering the clandestine importation of negroes into the plantations impossible, but as a regulation indispensably necessary for the gradual improvement of the condition of the slaves, and as one step towards their final emancipation. If no persons of colour could be considered as slaves but those whose names were on the registry, there would be an end of that cruel presumption which prevailed in all the colonies that every black man was a slave, which presumption he was to rebut as he could by legal evidence, and which was attended with the most fatal consequences. Sir Samuel Romilly insisted upon the right of the British Parliament to make such a law, and mentioned various instances of Acts passed to regulate the internal affairs of the islands, and he shewed by many instances how little was to be expected for the protection of the slaves and amelioration of their condition from the colonial legis-

latures. The bill was brought in and printed on condition of not being proceeded with that year. Some progress was thus made towards putting an end to the notion professed by the planters, that their colonial legislatures had the sole and exclusive right to make laws to regulate their own internal concerns.

The Parliamentary debate in June 1816, on the Registry Bill and on the then late insurrection in Barbadoes, called forth indignant words from Sir S. Romilly,* which seem equally applicable now in the United States. "Can it be possible," he says, "that the men who on this occasion maintain that they are not to be bound by any laws but such as have been made by themselves or their representatives, and who so loudly claim the benefits of the British Constitution, can have reflected in what it is that the spirit and genius of that Constitution really consist? Do they recollect that liberty and an equal protection by law of men of all ranks and descriptions are its most essential characteristics? Do they recollect that where a British Constitution really exists there can be no slavery, either political or domestic? that the moment a slave has come within its genial influence, he loses his servile character and becomes as free as ourselves? In truth, the greatest calamity which, in the present state of ignorance and barbarism of the slaves, could befal both them and their masters, would be to proclaim in the West-India islands that British Constitution in all its purity which the colonists so rashly and inconsiderately invoke, since it must be attended with the sudden and unprepared emancipation of all who are now in bondage. The real purpose, however, for which these noble doctrines of the British Constitution are appealed to by the West Indians, is to render domestic slavery more absolute and more intolerable under the auspices of English liberty than it has ever been even under the yoke of the most uncontrolled despotism. The arbitrary governments of France and Spain did not leave the slaves in their dominions to the legislative mercy of their masters. They took them under their own protection, and, by the humane provisions of the *Code Noir* and of the Spanish *Cedula*, enforced upon their owners an obedience to the dictates of justice, and restrained the excesses of private tyranny. But the spirit of English liberty, it is pretended, forbids any such interposition, and compels us to abandon these most helpless of our fellow-creatures to whatever fate their masters may ordain."

In 1818, an act of indemnity and explanation of the Slave-trade Abolition Acts was passed, 58 Geo. III., ch. 49; and by ch. 98, provision was made for the more speedy trial of offences against the Act of 1811, 51 Geo. III., ch. 23. About the same time treaties were concluded by England with Spain and Portugal for declaring the Slave-trade illegal, and Great Britain paid to

* See his Memoirs, Vol. III. p. 256, &c.

Spain £400,000 as compensation for the losses of Spaniards engaged in the traffic.

It was not till 1819 that the Act for registering colonial slaves was passed, 59 Geo. III., ch. 120. By this Act no slave could be sold or mortgaged unless he was registered. This was a most important step towards emancipation. The next and final step in the British legislature took fourteen years more for its accomplishment.

But in the mean time some things were done to prepare the way. For instance, in May, 1823, Thomas Fowell Buxton moved in the House of Commons that the state of slavery is repugnant to the principles of the British Constitution and of the Christian religion, and that it ought to be abolished gradually throughout the British colonies with as much expedition as may be found consistent with a due regard to the well-being of the persons concerned. Canning met this motion by resolutions (which were carried without a division) declaring the expediency of immediately ameliorating the condition of the British slave population, the hope that such amelioration might fit the slaves for freedom, and the desire of the House that these objects should be accomplished at the earliest period that the safety of all parties would allow.

Without loss of time, a circular was issued from Downing Street to the different islands in the West Indies, calling attention to the debate, and giving a decisive intimation that there must be an end of the flogging of women and of the use of the whip in the field.

Opposition arose in Jamaica and Barbadoes. In Demerara, the missionary John Smith became a martyr to the cause of the instruction of the negro. Then followed successive Orders in Council, appointing protectors of slaves, &c.

In 1827, in Berbice, the claim of a slave to purchase his liberty was sustained.

In 1832, a petition, signed by 135,000 Londoners, was presented to Parliament for the speedy abolition of slavery. In the same year the mother country granted nearly a million sterling to Jamaica as compensation for losses by a slave insurrection in that island.

At last came the Emancipation Act, 3 and 4 Wm. IV., ch. 73. This Act, as finally passed August 28, 1833, differed in several respects from the form in which it was first proposed. One of the original suggestions was to grant the slave-owners a loan of £15,000,000. But this was converted into a gift of £20,000,000. The Act was for three avowed objects: 1st, to abolish slavery throughout the British colonies; 2ndly, to promote the industry of the manumitted slaves; and 3rdly, to compensate the persons hitherto entitled to the services of such slaves. By that Act all slaves registered on August 1, 1834, were from that day made

free, and were converted into apprenticed labourers for four or six years, with power in the mean time to their masters to discharge them, and to the apprentices to purchase their discharge. The compensation was only to be paid to each of the nineteen slave-holding colonies on an Order in Council, certifying that the colony had made adequate and satisfactory provision for giving effect to the Act by such further and supplementary enactments as were specified in the Act. As to the compensation, no less than four subsequent Acts were passed. A fifth was necessary to remedy a defect in the Jamaica legislation on the subject. Many amendments in the Abolition Act of 1833 were also made in 1838 by 1 and 2 Vict., ch. 19. At last, however, all difficulties were surmounted, and all the objects of the emancipationists—freedom, industry and compensation—were safely accomplished.

If the liberation of no more than 800,000 persons in nineteen colonies cost so much time and labour and forethought, how much forethought and labour and time must the Americans spend before they can free their four millions of slaves, and wipe from the statute-book of the United States, as well as from the statute-book of each of their slave-holding States, the foul disgrace of permitting and sanctioning slavery! For be sure this is not (as Mr. May asserts) a mere question between the master and slave. It is a question between the whole State and the slave-owners, or rather between the whole of the United States and the slave-owners, and therefore affects every individual in all the States, Northern as well as Southern.

We in England know very little of the laws and constitution of the United States. But we cannot doubt that their constitution and the laws of every slave-holding State give, and have always given, to the slave-owner a civil right of property in his blacks. If this civil right is to be taken away by the legislature, it seems to our English notions most just and reasonable that the State should grant compensation to all from whom it takes the rights which have been long sanctioned by law.

One plan of emancipation which was practised on a West Indian plantation with success before 1833, I have learned from a friend who spent some time in the island of St. Vincent. It seems to me so admirable, that I dare not omit to mention it. The Sundays were before their own, and the manager began by giving the blacks the Saturdays, so that whatever they earned on a Saturday by working in their provision-grounds or otherwise was their own; and when they had thus accumulated money enough, he allowed them to buy up their Fridays, then their Thursdays, and so on till they had completely emancipated themselves. But from the first he paid them regular wages whenever they chose to work on the plantation either on the Saturday or on any other day which they had bought up. So profitable to the plantation and so beneficial to the blacks did

the manager find this plan, that when his first gang had completed their emancipation he began again with a second gang, and was proceeding with it when the ever-memorable day of freedom, the 1st of August, 1834, arrived.

The position of slaves in the United States seems to be in many respects so very different from that in which our West Indian slaves stood in 1833, that it may not be at all wise for the emancipation there to follow precisely in the footsteps of our legislation. Would it not be more appropriate for our cousins on the other side of the Atlantic to follow the example of such of their States as long ago abolished slavery? For Vermont alone, of all the States (as I believe), excluded slavery by her Bill of Rights in 1777. But, as I understand, Rhode Island and Connecticut before the end of the last century adopted a plan of gradual emancipation, declaring every black free who should be born after a future specified day; and Pennsylvania and New York before the end of the last century, and New Jersey in 1804 (if I am rightly informed), adopted a still more gradual plan of emancipation, declaring free all blacks born after a specified day on their attaining a specified age. As to the provisions made in Massachusetts and the other free States, I have no information.

Delay is, I fear, increasing the difficulties; for the number of slaves in all the States in 1840 was, I believe, under $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions, and in 1850 was returned as $3\frac{1}{4}$ millions, and is now estimated as at least 4 millions.

The difficulties, the honest convictions (or it may be the prejudices) and the enactments which have to be met, overcome, conciliated and altered, before this long-sanctioned abuse can be redressed in America, none but Americans can know; and the task of doing all this is, I fear, one which none but Americans can be competent to undertake. Some of them will need to remember that, in days of lawless violence and savage warfare, slavery may have been a great blessing in mitigating the horrors and slaughter of war. Others will learn, however slowly, that, banished as criminal from all Christian Europe, slavery is out of date in so free a country as the United States, and is demoralizing to all persons concerned; and that, if not an unmixed evil, its bad effects and tendencies greatly exceed any good fruit it can now be thought capable of bearing.

Little as, I fear, any foreigner can do to assist in this noble work, I have felt it a sacred duty to do what I could in a cause which I feel assured will, in His own good time, be blessed with success by Him who has "made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth."

I am, dear Sir, yours, &c.,

An English Lawyer.

*London, October* 21, 1859.

## REV. JOHN NOUAL'S TREATISE OF THE NEW CREATION.*

THE fourth text alledged to prove that Christ is the Maker of heaven and earth, is that famous place of the Epistle to the Colossians, ch. i. ver. 16, 17, "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalitys, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

We must examine three things in these words: 1. What is the true meaning of the word creating? 2. The subject of this new creation; and 3. The end of it, which is to exalt Christ above all intelligent creatures.

To find the true meaning of the word κτίζειν, translated by that of creating, we must consider these two things: to whom St. Paul addresses his discourse, and the aim of it. St. Paul speaks to heathens converted to Christianity, and sets before them, in the foregoing verses, these great truths:—1. That God by revealing to them the gospel, made them meet to be partakers of the promises of it, which are the inheritance of faithful believers (ver. 12). 2. That accordingly he had delivered them from heathenish darkness, translated them into the Christian church (ver. 13), wherein Christ, his dear Son, exercises his kingdom; and forgiven them (ver. 14) their sins for Christ's blood's sake, that they should not be an hindrance to their salvation; and, lastly, he sets before them (ver. 15) the greatness of their new Master, to let them know how able he was to procure their salvation, and finish the work of their redemption; he says of him that he "is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature;" that is, God's vicegerent, being invested with such power as makes him the Head and Lord over all creatures.

This last truth is that which he does intend to prove in the 16th ver.; therefore he shews that in Christ hath been created, or united, the angels who are the invisible things in heaven, and men, the visible things in earth; and concludes at the 17th ver., from that creation or union of all intelligent creatures under one head, that Christ is before all things, that is, the first-born of all creatures, the Lord of all, since they all consist or are united under him. That this is the true sense of these verses, we prove by the following observations.

1. We take our first proof from the apostle's scope and design, which is to shew that Christ is the first-born or the head of all creatures, not because he is the eternal God and Maker of all things,—this would be needless and ridiculous to go about to prove, that the Creator is above his creatures, which hold whatsoever they have from him,—but because he is the image of the invisible God, that is, invested, for the sake of his sufferings,

* Continued from p. 675.

with a supreme power by which he governs the Church which he hath redeemed by his blood. St. Paul, then, shews here Christ's pre-eminence above all, as being the Head of the Church, the Redeemer and Mediator; and this he proves at the 16th ver., because angels and men are put under him, and acknowledge him for their Head and Lord. Because, says the same apostle, Phil. ii. 8, 9, 10, 11, verses parallel'd with these, he "became obedient to death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God hath exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," that is, angels, men and devils.

2. We observe that the Greek word κτίζειν must not be translated *create*, but *unite*, for it certainly hath this meaning, as the Trinitarians themselves are forced to own, in two places of the 2nd chap. of the Epistle to the Ephesians, which are parallel'd with one part of the verse we expound. "We are," says St. Paul in the 10th ver., "his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works:" he speaks here to the Gentiles, as appears by the 11th verse, and shews them God's goodness towards them in calling them to the knowledge of the gospel, and creating them in Christ Jesus, that is, making of them his elect people, by uniting them under Christ their Head, that they should do good works, as he cleerly expresses himself at the 12, 13 and 14 ver. "At that time," says he, "ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." This is a true picture of their former condition; and then follows that of their latter, "Ye who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;" that is, as he expounds it at the 15th ver., "the law of commandments," for to make or to create (for the word κτίζειν is in the original) of twain one man; which word create evidently signifys unite, and so the sense of the verse is this: for to unite in him both Jews and Gentiles to make a new church, having abolished the law of Moses, the cause of the enmity between them. Which plainly shews that the sense of the word create in the 10th is the same with that of the 15th, which, doubtless, signifys unite. From this observation, we conclude that if St. Paul used this expression in speaking of the visible things of our text, that is, of Jews and Gentiles, members of the Christian church, and intended to express by it that Christ was their head, it must necessarily have the same meaning in the 16th verse of the Colossians, since his design is the same, which is to shew that angels and men are created or united in Christ Jesus, who by this means became their Lord, their Head, or the first-born of all creatures.

3. Another reason which cleerly evinces that the word κτίζειν, rendered in our Bible by *creating*, signifies *uniting*, is that St. Paul at the 17th verse, in concluding from what he had said, that "he is before all things," or the head of all, he uses a word, in setting down the reason of his being before all things, which certainly signifies *unite*. This word is that of συνίστημι, ill translated by that of *consist*. One need but open any Greek Dictionary to be convinced that the word συνίστημι, signifies *in unum componere, et consociare*, that is, *unite*. And, consequently, that the true sense of the 17th verse (which is but a consequence drawn from the 16th to prove that Christ is the first-born of all creatures) is, that Christ is the first, or Lord, of all things, of angels and men, because they are united under him, as the Greek word ought to be rendered, instead of *consist*.

4. The 20th verse of this same chapter plainly shews that the words *creating* and *consisting*, on which lies all the force of their objection, must be rendered as we have done, since this verse is but an explication of what he had said before: "It pleased the Father (having made peace through the blood of his cross) to reconcile all things to himself by him, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." If the Greek word καταλλάξειν, *reconcile*, signifies *unite*, as appears by the 16th verse of the 2nd chap. to Ephesians, which is the very same with this, "That he might reconcile both unto God," speaking of Jews and Gentiles made one people by the gospel, it necessarily follows that the word *creating* in the 16th verse to the Collossians, signifies nothing else but that great union of all intelligent beings under one head; since at the 20th verse, which is but an explanation of the 16th, he uses a word which undoubtedly hath this meaning.

5. Another reason which proves our explication to be the genuine sense of the word is, that by things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, we must necessarily understand men and angels, for three reasons:—1. Had St. Paul designed to speak of the creation of the world, he would have expressed himself otherwise, and said that heaven and earth were created by Christ; whereas he speaks only of the things which are in those places,—of those who dwell in them. 2. The apostle expounds in a more particular manner what he had said in a larger sense, according to the sacred writer's way. By the *invisible things in heaven*, he understands angels, whom he calls *thrones, dominions, principalitys and powers*, as 'tis agreed on both sides; so that by the *visible things* he must necessarily understand those that are in earth; viz., the church mentioned in the 18th verse, "And he is the head of the body, the church." This verse expounds part of the 16th, and shews that Christ is the head of visible things, because he hath created or united into one body both Jews and Gentiles, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence, which shews that St. Paul sticks close to his design,

which is to prove that Christ is the first-born of every creature in heaven and in earth. 3. The 20th verse evinces plainly that by things in heaven and in earth, which he calls visible and invisible, we must understand men and angels, for none but intelligent beings can be reconciled or united together under one head. If, then, it cannot be denyed that at the 20th verse, which is the conclusion of what he had said just before, things in heaven and earth signify angels and men, there is no reason to take these same expressions in a different sense at the 16th, wherein St. Paul speaks evidently of the same things and treats of the same subject.

6. Another reason which puts our sense beyond dispute is, that this creation or union of all things under Christ is attributed to God's goodwill and pleasure at the 19th verse, "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell;" that is, that both Jews and Gentiles, who are the fulness of the church, should make but one body under him. The word fulness is taken in this sense Eph. i. 23, which is a text parallel'd with this, and may here very well include the angels whom God hath pleased to put under Christ; for St. Paul having spoken of things visible and invisible that are in heaven and in earth, calls them here all fulness of the things or intelligent beings dwelling in those places. He expounds, himself, thus the word *fulness* at the 20th verse, which is next to it, when he says that it pleased Almighty God to "reconcile all things unto himself, whether they be things in heaven or in earth." So the word *all fulness*, signifying here all things contained in heaven and in earth, men and angels, whom God was pleased to make, dwell or put under Christ; 'tis evident that the sense we have given to the word *creating* and *consisting* is the true and genuine sense of the place, and that we cannot but understand here the great change or uniting of all creatures under one head, which God was pleased to do to reward Christ's sufferings.

7. The 21, 22 and 23 verses of the first chapter to the Ephesians, being parallel'd with these and establishing this great truth, prove evidently the apostle's meaning here to be the same. St. Paul shews clearly in those verses that God, having raised Christ from the dead, set him at his own right hand in heavenly places far above all angels, whom he calls principalities and powers, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all. Which great revolution he calls a uniting or gathering together in one, at the 10th verse of this same chapter,—that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven or which are on earth. He understands here by *all things*, angels and men, as appears by the conclusion of his discourse at the end of the chapter, which clearly proves that this great change was made by creating or

gathering together in one all intelligent creatures under Christ, whom God hath made Lord over all; and consequently that the expounding of the word *creating* by gathering or uniting together in one, is the true sense of this place in debate, since the scope of the apostle evinces it, since it agrees with the signification of the word in the parallel'd texts, and with the great and main doctrine of the gospel, which hath been revealed to shew us the glory Christ hath obtained, for his sufferings, over angels and men.

There are two other places of Scripture to be examined upon this subject, viz., Heb. i. 2, and Heb. i. 10, 11 and 12th verses. In order to the expounding of them, we must shew in few words the design of this Epistle, and make a short paraphrase on the whole first chapter.

The author of this Epistle writes to the Jews, Christian proselites, who were yet prepossessed of these three prejudices in behalf of the law of Moses, which they thought a more excellent dispensation than the gospel: 1, because it was delivered by angels; 2, given by the ministry of Moses, who spake to God face to face; and 3, because it 'twas grounded upon Aaron's priesthood, which was to last for ever. The great design of this Epistle is the answering these three objections. In the two first chapters the author answers the first, and proves Christ's excellency above the angels. In the third and fourth he answers the second, and shews that Moses' glory fell very short of that of Christ. And in the rest of the Epistle he shews the excellency of Christ's priesthood and sacrifice over the levitical priesthood and sacrifices.

As to the first objection, the Jews did say it was not likely that the law, being delivered with so great glory by the angels who are the most excellent of God's creatures, should be disanulled by the gospel, whose Mediator was but a prophet who appeared without any outward pomp. God himself, said they, came down and appeared with all his angels upon the Mount in a dreadfull and glorious manner, which he did not in the promulgation of the gospel.

The author answers this objection in the first chapter, and shews that tho' the gospel were not deliver'd by the angels with the same glory as the law, yet it was a more perfect law, and revealed by a person more excellent than the angels, which he proves:

1. By the dignity of the new Lawgiver, whom he calls the Son of God, so great a title as God never bestowed upon any angel.

2. By the abundance of revelation he brought. He shews at the first verse the imperfection of the old revelation, which was made at sundry times by degrees, by parsels, and consequently by different persons; whereas in these last days God hath spoken

to us and revealed his will, not by parsels, visions, dreams, or the ministry of some prophet or angel, but all at once by his own Son, begotten of God in a Virgin's womb, who was the promised Messiah and the great Light of the world.

3. Because God had appointed him Heir or Lord, not of a little part of the world, as were the angels to whom God had formerly given their particular lot or province over the nations, but of all the universal world, having exalted him above all intelligent creatures, and given him all power in heaven and in earth.

4. He shews Christ's excellency because God by him made the worlds, that is, establish'd the new covenant which was to stand for ever. God by the ministry of angels set up the legal œconomy, which the Jews called the *present world*, and was but for a time and onely for their nation; whereas the gospel dispensation made by Christ and called the *world to come*, and here *the worlds*, were made for all nations and designed to stand for ever and ever.

That this is the true sense of the word *worlds* in the second verse, we prove by five reasons:

1. By the scope of the apostle, which is to shew the excellency of Christ above angels by comparing their works together. If one ought to judge of the greatnesse of the workman by the excellency of the work, without doubt Christ will carry it above the angels, and his gospel above the law, since it was establish'd by greater miracles, designed for all men, and grounded for ever upon better laws and more glorious promises; and since the Mediator of it received greater power than the angels had, by which he made the new *worlds*, or establisht the gospel covenant.

2. We must observe that the author uses the word *worlds*, because it was an ordinary expression among the Jews, to signify either the legal or the gospel œconomy. There is an expresse text in this very Epistle which evidently proves that the legal œconomy, or the times of Moses' dispensation, were called so. Heb. ix. 26, "But now once in the end of the worlds," for 'tis in the Greek in the plural number, "hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." Where "by the end of the worlds," as in the third verse of the 24th chap. of St. Matthew, is evidently meant the end of the times of the law, which St. Peter, after the prophet Joel, in the 2nd chap. of the Acts and the 17th verse, calls "the last days," because the old worlds, or the legal œconomy, were at an end or ready to be abolisht to make room for the worlds of the gospel, which are the new heavens and the new earth, or that world to come which the Jews look'd for. Therefore, at the beginning of this verse, he calls the end of the law "the last days," in which God hath spoken to us by his Son, and afterwards he sets down what happeneth in them, viz., that Christ being appointed heir of all things, made the worlds. One may justly conclude that if the old œco-

nomy were called *worlds*, there is all reason to understand here by the *worlds* the gospel œconomy, since it is called by a prophet, and by an apostle, *new heavens and new earth*, and since the author of this Epistle, being a Jew, expresses himself according to his nation's way, which was, as every one knows, to call the times of the law the present world, and those of the Messiah the world to come.

3. We prove this to be the meaning of the word *worlds* here by Eph. i. 21. God, says St. Paul, speaking of Christ, "set him at his own right hand, far above all principality and every name that is named, not onely in this world but also in that which is to come;" whereby he understands that Christ was exalted above all those who had ever obtained any title or power, either under the law, which he calls this world, or the gospel, called the world to come. Or we may say that St. Paul does here distinguish the times of the gospel in two worlds; this world, that is, the state of the Christian church upon earth, and the world to come, that of the same church in heaven; which shews the reason why the gospel œconomy is called here in the plural number, the *worlds*, and how well-grounded we are to understand by those worlds, the gospel œconomy. The author of this Epistle himself calls the miraculous gifts received under the gospel, the "powers of the world to come" (Heb. vi. 5).

4. We must observe that the apostle uses this expression to signify that Jesus was the promised Messiah who was to create this new world, according to the description Isaiah makes of him at the 9th chap. of his revelation, the 6th ver., wherein he calls him "the Father of the world to come," which Hebrew words we have ill translated "the everlasting Father." Whereas the Septuagint and the author of the Vulgar rendered them "the Father of the world to come," i. e. of that œconomy which was to last for ever, which Christ hath establish'd by bringing life to light and immortality by the gospel. Therefore Daniel calls the Messiah "the Righteousness of the worlds," as 'tis to be rendered, instead of "everlasting Righteousness;" because Christ by setting up a new covenant was to let us know the faithfulness of God's promises, teach us the true way to please him, and procure us the true righteousness which make us find mercy before him. This is called the righteousness of the worlds because 'twas to be manifested at the times of the Messiah, here called the worlds made by Christ.

5. Another proof, which sets above all contestation that the *worlds* signify here the state of the Christian church, is that which we take out of the 2nd chapter of this same Epistle, and the 5th verse, where the author expresses it very clearly: "For unto the angels hath he not put into subjection the world to come whereof we speak." Is it not as clear and evident as can be, that the world here in question, which Christ made and over

which he rules, is the state of the Christian church whereof he had spoken before, by opposition to the Jewish œconomy which was put under the angels, who, as God's deputies, ruled over the people of Israel? Whereas the Christian church acknowledges no other Founder, no other Lord than Christ. It is not unto the angels, as the old world was, but to Christ alone, that this world whereof we speak, which God made by Christ, is put in subjection. The author having spoken of nothing else but of the gospel dispensation, of the state of the Christian church whereof Christ is Lord, because he founded it upon his own blood, 'tis evidently manifest that the word *worlds* in the second verse of the first chapter, and the *world to come* in this verse, are one and the same thing; the apostle expounding more particularly by the *world to come*, what he had in a more general expression before called the *worlds*.

After all these observations, which must convince any considering man of the verity of our explication, we go on to paraphrase the rest of the chapter, which will both furnish us with a new proof, and give great light in order to the expounding of the 10th, 11th and 12th verses, which are the last places of Scripture we design to examine.

Ver. 3. Christ being appointed Heir or Lord of all things, sustains the brightness of God's glory and majesty in a more glorious manner than the angels under the law, and is a more express image of his person. Because he hath been made King over all to the end of the world, and hath greater power than the angels, who were but for a while God's vicegerents, having purged our sins, he sits at the right hand of God to exercise his power for ever.

This is the thing which the author intends to prove that Christ hath been made Lord of all for his sufferings. The apostle's design, then, is to shew here the glory of Christ considered as Mediator. The question being thus stated, he brings five reasons to prove it.

Ver. 4. First, he shews in this verse and in the next to it, that Christ is above the angels, not because he is the eternal Son of God, and consequently God himself,—it would be needless to prove that God is above his creatures,—but because he hath obtained a more excellent name than the angels, viz., the Son's name, which shews the superiority he has over them, and his right to be heir of all things.

Ver. 5. Which is so great a name as the angels never obtained; for we never read that he said to any one of them what he said often to Christ, but especially when he raised him from the dead, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee" (Acts xiii. 33); that is, I have exalted thee to the highest degree of power.

Ver. 6. Which exaltation he proves, secondly, by the authority God had given him over those blessed spirits, when he

bringeth in Christ into the world, and declares him the first begotten or the first-born of all creatures, and hereupon applies to this present subject what Moses said of the people of Israel, "Let all the angels of God worship him," that is, honour him. This citation, as Epiphanes, Eusebius and Hilarius have observed, is taken from the version of the Septuagint, Deut. xxxii. 43, wherein the same Greek words are to be found; and here Moses speaks, out of a prophetick spirit, of the Jews whom God was to bring again into the land of Canaan after the captivity of Babilon, and put under the angels' special care. Whereas if ye take them out of the 9th Psalm, we must change the words and force the sense, as those who understand the Greek tongue may satisfy themselves if they will but examine these two places. This observation quite destroys the argument of the Trinitarians taken from this text; for if these words, "Let all the angels of God worship him," have been first said of the people of Israel, why, being applyed to Christ by way of accommodation, should they prove that he is the Supreme God?

Ver. 7. Thirdly, he shews here that angels when they deliver'd the law were but as servants of God's heralds, and for a while, therefore, the Scripture describes them executing God's orders as swift as the wind and as quick as lightning.

Ver. 8. Whereas Christ is described to us in the person of king Solomon, who was his type, as a King or as a God, whose power was to last for ever; because his gospel is grounded upon eternal reason, and his empire establish'd upon righteousness, in opposition to the law which, tho' delivered by angels, was founded upon God's meer bene placitum, upon positive commands, which God could abrogate without wronging either his wisdom or his constancy.

Ver. 9. But he cannot do the same with the gospel, because it hath been founded upon the eternal reason, which shews the good we must love and the evil we must hate. Hence 'tis that Christ is invested with a supreme power to maintain it for ever, and anointed with a spirit without measure, which none but he hath received.

Christ's throne, then, being establish'd upon eternal reason, and grounded upon God's power, who anointed him above all his fellows, the apostle concludes that it is for ever and ever, and that tho' God sometimes change his other works, as he did the law of Moses, yet this being founded upon such grounds shall stand for ever; which truth he proves by the 10, 11 and 12th verses taken out of the 102nd Psalm. And here is his way of arguing.

He shews by these verses that tho' God should fold up as a vesture the heavens and change them, yet this will not argue unconstancy in him, for we must not judge of God by the changeing of his works, but by the design he had when he made them.

Heaven and earth, the fairest of his works, may perish, because he did not design they should stand for ever, yet God is always the same; from hence he concludes that Christ's throne shall be for ever and ever; because God who is always the same hath said so in the 45th Psalm, and will perform it according to his word. The author then brings in these verses, not by way of accommodation to Christ, as some would have it, and as if they were applyed to the new creation, but as a proof taken from God's immutability to shew that Christ's kingdom shall stand for ever; because God having anointed Christ to be king for ever, and being always the same, tho' some of his works perish, shall be firm in his resolution and shall make his design stand fast.

Here you are to admire the strength and wisdom of the proof. The apostle, foreseeing an objection which could be made to him for saying that Christ's throne is for ever and ever, alledges a text which both answers the objection and proves his assertion. What assurance, might the Jews say, have we that God, who as you say yourself hath put an end both to the angels' government and to the law delivered by them, shall not put an end to Christ's kingdom and gospel? If he hath abolished the law, his first work, and been thus inconstant, how shall we know that Christ's religion shall stand for ever?

The apostle answers their objection, and proves his doctrine, by these verses of the 102nd Psalm, which shew that tho' God change his works and let them perish as he pleases, yet he cannot be charged with inconstancy; because one must judge of God's immutability, not by the changing of his works, but by the design he had at their first making. His works may perish, because when he first created them he intended they should stand but for a while; for tho' heaven and earth, the finest of his works, should come to perish, yet it would do no wrong to God's constancy, who among all these changes would remain always the same, immutable and firm to his resolutions. Therefore having declared that Christ's kingdom was to be for ever and ever, and anointed him king with this purpose and resolution, his throne shall stand firm, because God, who is always the same, designed, when he made him king, to continue his kingdom to the end of the world.

Ver. 13. Which cannot be said, says he, of the angel government, since we read nowhere that God said to any of them, when he gave them some authority under the law, that he would leave it in their hands to maintain their work against their enemies, as he said expressly to Christ in the 1st ver. of the 110th Psalm. This is the fourth reason which shews Christ's excellency above the angels: "To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstool?" as he

said to Christ, to whom he hath given all power, till he hath overcome all the enemies of his gospel, death itself, which shall be the last.

Ver. 14. As for the angels, God never designed to invest them for ever with the power Christ is invested with, since we see them (this is the fifth reason) put under Christ, who sends them as he pleases, for the good of his faithfull believers; which shews that Christ is their king and infinitely more excellent than they, since they are but his servant's servants.

This paraphrase seems cleer, coherent, and agreeing with the author's design, which is to shew the greatness Christ had obtain'd for his sufferings above the angels and the duration of it. If this be his design, one cannot with the least shadow of reason make him alledge the verses of the 102nd Psalm to prove that Christ is the Maker of heaven and earth; since he speaks here onely of Christ's exaltation, received as a reward for his death from God who is always the same. Were this text brought in to prove the eternity of Christ's kingdom because he is God, this would be nothing to the purpose, for then the author would speak of an essential kingdom instead of a kingdom given and obtained. Besides, what need so many reasons be brought to prove that the Creator is above his creatures, and that his kingdom shall have no end; for whether those to whom the author writes did believe Christ to be the Supreme God or not,—if they did believe it, why does he trifle and loose time to prove by degrees and arguments that he is above the angels? and if they did not believe it, he cites a place of Scripture which had not convinced them, since the Psalmist speaks evidently of the God worshipped among the Jews, who is none else but the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

From all these observations, we may conclude that our explication of this difficult place is solid and true, and consequently that there is no ground to attribute to any other the creation of the world, which is onely the work of God, as the new creation is that of Christ, "for without him was not any thing made that was made."

We set down clearly these two great truths by expounding in a genuine and true sense all the texts alledged against them. We shewed that in all those places wherein the Scripture speaks of Christ as making or creating all things, the sacred writers meant nothing else but all things which Christ made for men's salvation and for the establishing of the gospel; and so defeated the Trinitarians' pretence, which is to prove, out of them, Christ to be the Maker of heaven and earth, and consequently the Supreme God. These texts being their most considerable proofs and their greatest hold, we have enlarged ourselves in the expounding of them to undeceive many, and convince all

considering men that there is no ground in all the Scripture to rob God the Father of the glory of being the only Maker of the world and the onely God.

One may see by this little essay that if we row against the stream, we mean honestly; 'tis neither out of pride, or spirit of party and wilfull obstinacy, as our opposers charge us with, but onely out of zeal for God's glory. The strength of truth and a spirit of charity induce us to write upon this subject. We can neither see Christians so strangely misled, nor suffer that upon some places of Scripture ill understood, God should be robbed of the glory of being the only God and the only Creator. We love Christ and his religion, and are loth to see it the scorn of atheistical wits; therefore we endeavour to set it forth in its native simplicity, and free it from all those uncouth and mysterious doctrines which men, listening more to Plato than to Christ, have added to it, and which, as so many clouds, have so darkened the light of the gospel as to keep it from the eyes of many who reject revelation under pretence that it teaches things contrary to the natural notions of mankind, and to the idea they have of one God.

'Tis my hearty wish that all Christians, minding that this controversy is of the last importance, and considering the causes of the decay of Christianity among us, would at last inquire who is the true God who onely deserves our worship, examine whether whatever is offered to them as a fundamental doctrine be contained in the Scriptures or not, and search seriously and diligently into them, which seldom fail of enlightening those that seek for the truth with an earnest and honest desire of finding it. If Christians could be but once persuaded that Christ's religion is plain and easy, within our reach, and that whatsoever it reveals to us of God's design in Christ Jesus is grounded upon solid reasons which any understanding might early apprehend, they would soon undeceive themselves, and know that the gospel was never designed to puzzle our heads with incomprehensible mysteries, but to fill our minds with wise doctrines and powerfull motives to the practice of Christian vertue and charity.

---

## ON AN UNNOTICED TESTIMONY TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN.

It is well known, that an animated controversy is now going on among the learned of the Continent respecting the authorship of the different writings in the New Testament which bear the name of John. There is a pretty general agreement among them that the Apocalypse and the Gospel cannot be the production of the same mind. The Baron Bunsen, I believe, still contends

for an identity of authorship; but his is almost the only name of eminence and authority on that side of the question. De Wette does not hesitate to affirm in the last edition of his Introduction, that "no result in the criticism of the New Testament is more firmly established than this: that if the apostle John be the author of the Gospel and the Epistles, he cannot have written the Apocalypse, and *vice-versa*."* It is important, therefore, to collect and estimate all the ancient testimonies that can be adduced for the authorship by the apostle John, of the Gospel and Epistles on the one hand, and of the Apocalypse on the other. They will then have to be weighed against each other. As the Apocalypse must, on every supposition, be regarded as the older production (its date probably, from internal evidence, not being later than the reign of Galba or Nerva),† it seems the proper order to examine first the passages in ancient writers, which ascribe the authorship of that work to the apostle John. The testimonies in Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Origen, are full and clear. The passages may be seen in Lardner and other Introductions to the New Testament. But there is one witness of some weight, which, so far as I know, has hitherto escaped notice. It is not cited in the last edition of Lücke's very voluminous Introduction to the Apocalypse (Bonn, 1852), though the work in which it occurs had been published the preceding year, and Lücke himself (II. p. 592, note 3) refers to its recent appearance. The work I allude to, is the "Treatise on Heresies," published by Emmanuel Miller at Oxford in 1851 from a single MS., which a few years previously had been brought from Greece under the name of Origen, though it is assigned by Baron Bunsen, whose work under the same title excited much attention at the time, to Hippolytus. Whoever be its author, the work undoubtedly belongs to the close of the second or the early part of the third century of our era. The passage bearing on the Apocalypse occurs in the 7th book (p. 258 of Miller's edition), where the author is speaking of Nicolaus, the founder of the sect of Nicolaitans, and in the *corrected* text of Miller runs as follows: *οὗ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐνυβρίζοντας τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννης ἤλεγχε πορνεύοντας καὶ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίοντας*: "Whose disciples treating with contumely the Holy Spirit, John in the Apocalypse convicted of fornication and of eating things offered to idols." The passage, so read, asserts *a* John to be the author of the Apocalypse, but does not decide *what* John. It may be John the Presbyter, also of Ephesus, and a contemporary of the apostle, to whom Dionysius of Alexandria

* "Steht kein Ergebniss fester als dieses." Einl. N. T., § 189 e.

† Such is the judgment of Lücke and Ewald. Sir Isaac Newton put it as early as the reign of Nero, though he is strongly opposed on this point by Dr. Lardner. (Hist. of Evangelists and Apostles, ch. ix., Works, 8vo, Vol. VI. p. 177 et seq.)

was disposed to ascribe the work, or John Mark, whom others had suggested as its possible author. In this form, therefore, the passage does not positively affirm the apostolic authorship. I am inclined, however, to think that the original reading was the true one, and that it has been unnecessarily altered by Miller. It stands in the MS. thus: *οὗ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐννβρίζον τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διὰ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου ἤλεγχε*, &c.: "Whose disciples the Holy Spirit contemptuously chiding, convicted in the Apocalypse of John of," &c. If this be the true reading, John is made the vehicle of the Holy Spirit; the Holy Spirit rebukes through him: and a writer at the opening of the third century, when there was a growing disposition in the Church to trace back an *inspired* canon to an *apostolic* source, would hardly have asserted this of any one but an apostle.* It is true that a passage in Hebrews (x. 9), *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐννβρισας*, may seem to favour Miller's correction, and was perhaps in his mind when he suggested it; but the passage in the book of Revelation here referred to (ii. 14—17, comp. 6), is strongly in favour of the original reading. The Spirit in this passage rebukes the doctrine and works of the Nicolaitans in the most vehement terms, and threatens them with utter destruction; and though the words which express this contemptuous abhorrence most forcibly, *ὃ μισῶ*, are not supported by the best authorities in ver. 15, and are therefore omitted by Griesbach, Lachmann and Tischendorf in their editions, yet they occur a little further back at ver. 6, *τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, ἃ κἀγὼ μισῶ*, and infuse their bitterness into the entire context. These are the utterances of the Spirit; and the frequently recurring words: *ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*, may seem to have suggested the very form of expression employed in the original reading of the passage under consideration. On the whole, then, I think we may regard this passage as another witness for the *apostolic* authorship of the Apocalypse. Of course there are authorities on the other side; but this seems to me an additional weight in one scale.

One other fact I would mention, as an element that must enter into the discussion of the general critical question. At the conclusion of the treatise on Heresies, there is a statement at some length of the creed of its author, in which the doctrine of the Logos occupies the principal place, presenting a theology closely allied to that which runs through our fourth Gospel. Throughout the whole of this statement there is no mention of John as the author of a Gospel, nor, that I can observe, any implied allusion to him.

J. J. T.

* A critical edition of this work on "Heresies" by Duncker and Schneidewin, with a carefully revised text, appeared in Germany a few years ago. But I have never seen it; and whether they have allowed the original reading of this passage to remain, or have adopted the emendations of Miller, I cannot tell.

# CORRESPONDENCE.

## OUR LIBERTY TO NAME OLD CHAPELS UNITARIAN.

In the controversy which "our Position" has raised up there seems to me to be considerable misapprehension as to the origin and historical progress of many of the congregations of Protestant Dissenters which in the present day avow doctrines of the Unitarian type. It is supposed that we are precluded from calling ourselves Unitarians, or from naming the old congregations Unitarian congregations, because the original title-deeds are free from theological doctrine. I confess that I do not come to this conclusion, but the very opposite, and for the reasons which follow.

I am satisfied, from documentary evidence, that, with respect to two of the oldest congregations of Dissenters in Cheshire, Presbyterianism, as a mode of church government, and Trinitarianism, as a system of doctrine, were intrusions rather than original principles. I have before me a church agreement of the year 1689; it is headed, "The Church of the Word gathered in order, March the 2nd, 1689," and consists but of one article—"Memorandum, That wee whose names are subscribed being (through grace) made sensible of our want of Gospell order and priviledges, doe unanimously agree to joyne together (the Lord assisting) for the enjoyment of Gospell order and priviledges."

To this memorandum 23 names are subscribed, and then these words are annexed:

"Those that joyned to the Church were in these Wordes,—Wee doe declare and promise to give up ourselves to Christ as Lord and Lawgiver, Husband and Head, and to this pticular Church to walk orderly with them in all Gospell ordinances."

The exact terms of church agreement entered into by the Knutsford congregation of Dissenters I have not been able to ascertain, but it is pretty certain they did not in any express way recognize at first either the Presbyterian name or discipline. The right of the town of Knutsford to elect their own clergyman had been set aside about the year 1687; and then "many of the inhabitants that had never been Dissenters joyned with others that had been always Dissenters in judgment, to set up a Meeting and invite a Dissenting minister to come and preach to them." The first trust-deed of 1694 does not use the word Presbyterian, nor does any succeeding deed. The original trustees are named, "trustees for and on behalf of his Majesty's Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England, united into a congregation in and about the town of Nether Knutsford;" the chapel is declared to be built and fitted up "for the said congregation to assemble and meete in for praying, preaching and other religious exercises;" and the most ancient bequest, that of 1699, provides for a yearly interest of money to be paid "for or towards the maintenance of a preaching minister at the new chapell or meeting-house in Nether Knutsford aforesaid, soe long as there shall be a preaching minister there." The chapel ground being leasehold, on an additional plot being taken, the old lease of 1694 was surrendered in 1733, and a new settlement made of the "chappell used as a place of divine worship for Protestant Dissenters;" and the trustees

were enjoined to permit the said chapel "to be used for a place of meeting or assembling together of Protestant Dissenters for the public exercise of divine worship," "so long as the tolleration and indulgence granted" by the Act of William III., "*or any further or other tolleration or indulgence be granted by any further or other Statute or Act of Parliament shall continue or be allowed.*"

Now these are undoubtedly charters of a very wide and broad religious liberty; but how were they interpreted by the very men who established them? Certainly not to bar out the profession of special doctrines; for in 1692, T. Kinaston, the minister of Knutsford, R. Holland, of Allostock, and several other Cheshire ministers, signed "the Heads of Agreement assented to by the United Ministers in and about London, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational,"—and those "Heads of Agreement" recognized the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England and the Westminster Catechisms and Confession. For about sixty years a Presbyterian mode of church discipline was carried out, including censures and suspensions, and a non-admission to the Lord's Table unless satisfaction were given to the minister and church with whom communion was sought. Before 1750, the Presbyterian discipline broke down and was discontinued, changes in doctrinal opinions went on, and by the end of the century the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England ceased to represent the opinions either of the ministers or of the congregations. Early in the present century the same minister was sometimes named Presbyterian, and at other times Unitarian, until now the latter is the only correct designation.

But as under the free constitution of a Dissenting chapel for the public worship of God and for the public ordinances of religion, the men of 1692 adopted a Trinitarian confession of faith, so under the same free constitution might the men of 1792 profess the Unitarian doctrines: if there was a breach of trust in the latter instance, there was in the former. But I interpret the constitution historically, and justice and common sense both assure me that with a constitution like that of the Knutsford Dissenters' chapel of 1688, or of the Allostock "Church of the Word" of 1689, people are at perfect liberty, unchallenged by the *dilettanti* of preciseness, to profess Trinitarianism in one age and Unitarianism in another, and to call themselves and their chapels either Trinitarian or Presbyterian or Unitarian. Once Presbyterianism denoted the church government, now Congregationalism is its characteristic; once Calvinism prevailed, then Arminianism; the Trinity with its *et ceteras* was once subscribed to, now subscription to a human creed is utterly ignored, and the nobler faith of the Divine Unity and essential love of God is avowed; but I no more depart from my principles as a Dissenter in confessing to the one, than the forefathers of this congregation did in attaching their signature to the other. They entered on a free inheritance and freely they spoke out their souls; the silence and constraint of a changing theology then bore sway; but when the free inheritance is again possessed by persons all agreed on essential doctrines, we are as free as our spiritual forefathers, and may freely avow our Unitarianism.

Judging historically, therefore, that is by the mode in which our spiritual forefathers used their freely-constituted chapel, I only follow out their practice by saying what I am,—naming myself a Unitarian

minister and my congregation a Unitarian congregation. Out of our hands the chapel will pass as freely as it came; and if the generation to come as quietly, as peaceably and as honourably relapse into orthodoxy, an orthodox name they and their minister may again assume. That future, however, must provide for its own religious honesty. I have only to provide for my own, and my duty it is not to take up a name, as Presbyterian, which does not describe the church discipline I am under, nor as Calvinist and Trinitarian, which do not describe the doctrines of my faith. A Unitarian, in the broad comprehensive meaning of the word, I am; and it is more honest both to my own conscience and to the world to bear the reproach, if it be a reproach, than to shrink behind the paper-rampart of the supposed open communion and free theology of a former age.

In 1692, Robert Holland, under his Charter of Dissenters' Liberty, did not, by signing the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, prejudice the John Holland of 1750, who under the same charter and from the same pulpit declared, "One might extract from the writings of eminent divines, venerable names, who in their *day* were regarded by some as a sort of *oracles* in the affairs of religion," "such a character of THE EVER BLESSED GOD as were bad enough for the most detestable tyrant upon earth. Do I feign? Could I not *name* them? I wish heartily I could not! But I wish to expose not *men*, but their pernicious opinions" (Sermons, I. p. 29). Much less did the John Holland of 1750, by this strong declaration, prejudice the right of the Thomas Holland of 1859 from professing, under that same Charter of Dissenters' Liberty, a full and entire Unitarianism. Now we are children not of the bondman, but of the free, and by so much the more may assert our freedom.

To interpret the inheritance of religious liberty in a narrower spirit than historical facts justify, is surely of all things most unreasonable; but if, though men of the seventeenth century interpreted their liberty to allow of subscription to Calvinistic articles and confessions, men of the nineteenth century must speak "with 'bated breath" of this being "life eternal to know the Father as the only true God, and Jesus to be the Christ whom he sent,"—the argument seems to me so much moonshine; neither my physics nor my metaphysics enable me to bottle it up; and when I put the cork into the vessel that should contain it and apply a test, I find that there is nothing but emptiness *in vacuo*.

Though ministering in an old chapel, and to a congregation as ancient as "the glorious memory," I feel therefore that I only use my Dissenter's liberty as my spiritual forefathers have done, in speaking the Word with all plainness to "a Church of the Word," and in maintaining "there is but one God Supreme, and none other than he," and that the only religious worship which Christ authorized was, to worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

HENRY GREEN.

## MR. MACDONALD ON THE UNITARIAN POSITION CONTROVERSY.

Sir,

The discussion on the "Unitarian Position," inaugurated, I believe, by myself, has assumed more gigantic proportions than I had reckoned on, and drawn forth a host of critics of almost every variety of tone and sentiment. The publication of Mr. Martineau's first letter, although approved by some, has been condemned by others, being calculated, it is thought, to sow dissension in our body, and afford a handle to the enemies of the faith. As it was at my suggestion that this letter was laid before the public, I feel that I am really responsible for that act with all its consequences, whatever they may be. But I must say that I cannot join in the feelings or fears of those who think it an unwise step to publish the deliberately-formed opinion of one of our most learned and accomplished men on a question vitally affecting the interests of our church.

By far the most elaborate and satisfactory criticism which Mr. Martineau's views have received, is to be found in the "Strictures" of the Editor of the Christian Reformer, who may be considered best perhaps to represent the older school of thought amongst us. Yet I venture to affirm that there is no irreconcilable difference between Mr. Martineau's position and your own; and it seems to me that the strength of our church really lies in this blending of the newer with the older modes of thought—of our naturalism with our scripturalism—the philosophical with the historical element—or, if you please, the mystic with the rationalistic tendencies of our body. In my judgment, that will be the saddest day that has ever dawned upon our branch of the Christian church when the one element succeeds in expelling the other.

Almost the whole of Mr. Martineau's critics seem to have fallen into the error of supposing that he disclaims the Unitarian theology and dislikes the Unitarian name; whereas what he really asserts is, that his sympathies and affinities refuse to limit themselves to believers in the Divine Unipersonality,—and that as we have inherited a free gospel from the past, we should be careful to transmit that noble inheritance to the future. I am much mistaken if there be any English Presbyterian, of whatever school, who truly understands and values his principles, that will demur to this statement. Surely it is not one of the least honourable characteristics of Unitarians that their religious feelings and sympathies far overleap the boundaries of their own denomination, and that they are taught to regard every humble and earnest Christian of whatever sect as a true disciple of the Master, a member of the Church Universal. You yourself nobly endorse the same sentiment when you say, "Nor do we feel that our Unitarian name and profession interfere in any degree with our sympathizing with sincere and earnest Christians of every sect."

Both sides, then, are agreed that we have a theology founded upon the doctrine of the Divine Unity, whose proper name is "Unitarianism." No one is ashamed of the name; no one proposes to abandon the name, or to substitute any other name. On the contrary, we are all of us—old school and new—most justly proud of it; and we are all resolved to adhere to it so long as it describes our theological position. The real and only point of difference is this, viz., whether we are to consider our

body as a society *banded together for* the support and propagation of Unitarian principles, or simply as that branch of the Christian church which *has come to adopt* Unitarian principles. Some of your readers may possibly smile at this, and call it a distinction without a difference. In reality, however, there is a difference, though whether readily appreciable or very important, I will not undertake to determine. In the first case, you make Unitarianism the binding principle of our association, without which it has no meaning and no object; in the second case, you affirm that we are that section of the church which in the exercise of its Christian liberty has become Unitarian, but which as it has a past, so also may have a future existence independently of its Unitarianism.

For my own part, I cannot help feeling that the latter definition includes the former, and is the truer and nobler position. It is true, I think, that we are a *society* of Christians holding distinct and definite views of theology, and therefore bound to support and propagate those views; but not the less true that we are a *church* with other functions than those of a polemic association, and other ties and affinites than mere intellectual agreement. And thus, it seems to me, we should resolve this *vexata quæstio*. A church is something more than a theological society. The greater includes the less. We have a pure and noble faith which it is our duty to maintain and to spread; we have also, I hope, affinities of spirit, ties of reverence and of sympathy, which bind us not alone to those of our own faith, but to the wise and good, the gentle and true, of other faiths, ages and lands.

S. F. Macdonald.

*Chester, Nov.* 10, 1859.

---

## THE SLIGHTERS OF THE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

Others have publicly and very strongly proclaimed their conviction that any inquiry into the evidences of our religion is most likely to lead to infidelity. "Many thanks," an infidel might reply, "for that admission! I want nothing more. That all inquiry, while it will establish a belief in what is true, will overthrow belief in Christianity or any other imposture, is just what I think. But nothing coming from *me* could have near the force of such an admission from *you*." One is loth to attribute to writers who are professed advocates of Christianity an insincere profession and a disguised hostility. And yet, supposing them sincere, the absurdity of their procedure seems almost incredible. Let one of these writers imagine himself tried in a court of justice, and his counsel pleading for him in a similar manner: "Gentlemen of the jury, my client is an innocent and worthy man, take my word for it; but I entreat you not to examine any witnesses or listen to any pleadings, for the more you inquire into the case, the more likely you will be to find him guilty." Every one would say that this advocate was either a madman or else wilfully betraying his client.—*Archbishop Whately on Paley's Works.*

# CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Fontanèse's Sermon on the Spirit of the Reformation.*

Even in some professedly "orthodox" churches, there have not been wanting of late instances of activity of intellect in religious matters, leading in some cases to the throwing off dogmatic thraldom. The French Protestant Church, as a whole, has been very remarkable for this healthy vitality. In the month of May last they celebrated the third Jubilee of the Reformation, and many noble sermons, full of grand and liberal thought and sweetest feeling, were delivered from the French pulpits on that occasion. To one of these, by means of some translated extracts, we wish more particularly to draw our readers' attention. It was preached in the Protestant temple of Havre by Mons. Ernest Fontanèse, one of the pastors, and by him published at the request of many members of the congregation. It is a sermon remarkable for eloquence and power, and especially commendable to all liberal theologians for the just view it takes of the Reformation, describing it, not as the definite settlement of a new church once and for all, but as a protest of the conscience against the attempt of any human authority to effect any settlement whatever, except such as might be suggested by local and temporary expediency, and therefore alterable in new phases of society and under new conditions of affairs. This principle was not always faithfully adhered to by the Reformers themselves, at least not by all of them; but it was distinctly enunciated by some, and by others illustrated in life-long endurance and untiring activity. Alexander Vinet has well defined it—"The Reformation is not so much an event which can be dated, as a principle whose action is perpetual and sustaining. Its activity is constant, and renews itself unceasingly."

After some preliminary historical references, and a generous appeal to his auditors to recall the past in the spirit of forgiveness for injury and wrong, M. Fontanèse proceeds to say:

"With respect to the work of our fathers and the forms under which it put itself forth, we must maintain, while looking at it, a perfect liberty.

"Respectable monuments of a Past full of grandeur and of religious life, the Confession of Faith of La Rochelle and of this same Synod (that of Paris, May 26, 1559) are no longer fitted for our age, no longer answer to our wants and circumstances. Read these pious declarations, and you will be convinced that it is no longer there that can be found the expression of your faith and the faith of the church. Let us not forget the humble words of Paul, 'We have this treasure (the knowledge of God) in earthen vessels.' Let us not cling to the vase of clay. Time, the great servant of God, has broken the earthen vessel in which the Reformers had deposited the truth; the fragments of it are scattered abroad, and vain is it for pious hands to attempt to re-unite them: the system is condemned. For our age, for our culture, for our knowledge of holy writ, we have need of another formula, another 'earthen vessel.' In recalling the work of our fathers, in celebrating their courage and their faith, let us hold fast to the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and never submit to the yoke of a new servitude."

These heroic words so fully admit the principle of change, growth and expansion in individual minds, and in that agglomeration of minds, a church, that even the most fastidious lover of independence, the most impatient of the slightest authority necessarily resulting from organiza-

tion, must feel some sympathy with the man and the community that thus allow their opinions and habitudes to be fleeting, and only the sacred spirit to be eternal.

The doctrine of justification by faith, as distinguished from justification by discipline and obedience to a church, was a leading idea in the minds of the early Reformers. Mark how this doctrine, passing through the alembic of the preacher's generous mind, separates itself from those absurdities with which theologians in general have been wont to mingle it:

"No doubt when the scholastic Protestant had petrified this dogma into a narrow formula, and a theologian (Nicholas von Amsdorf) had proclaimed that good works were even hurtful to salvation, then did the truth disappear in absurdity; but justification by faith, properly understood and received not in the letter which killeth, but in the spirit which giveth life, is a doctrine most true, most fruitful, one which assures to morality all its grandeur and efficacy, and which reproduces in all its beauty the divine teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. It is faith which justifies before God, that is to say, it is an inward disposition which inspires your actions and your sentiments; it is the new love which you bear in your heart which makes of you a new creature and which renders you just before God. Seek not, oh my brother, the pretended interpreters of God! Subject not yourselves to the yoke sought to be imposed upon you! Salvation is not of any creature, nor of any work; the kingdom of God consists not in meats and drinks, in fasts or alms, in ceremonies or pilgrimages; it is no longer in a doctrine, in fidelity to a consecrated system, in the profession of a faith rigidly orthodox. No! *the kingdom of God is within you.* It is in your heart that you must receive it and guard it there. Enter in thyself; impose silence on the world; hush the voices of passion; listen to the voice of God; humble thyself; confess thy weakness; hearken when God calls thee; he invites thee to the banquet of reconciliation; he announces that he will come, that he will take up his abode with thee. Oh! seize upon these words of love; lock them in thy heart; and now go thy ways; thou art a child of God; go on from progress to progress; be faithful to thy vocation; work and hope! God is no longer the Judge who demands of thee a reckoning for the violation of the law; he is no longer the merciless creditor who demands that the debt must be paid; he is the Father who opens his arms, who abides with thee to render thee victorious over the world and deliver thee from evil. This is the sublime sense of justification by faith. Salvation is a new principle of life; it is a purifying fire which burns within us; and religion has neither power nor efficacy but inasmuch as it is inward, seizes on every faculty of the human being, and becomes the personal assimilation of the truth."

Error and weakness now and then characterized the early Reformers, as they have ever characterized all humanity. Among them, as amongst us, it may be that a Christian doctrine was sometimes expounded in an unchristian temper, and the advocate interested more for his party on earth than for his Master in heaven. These imperfections of character are candidly admitted by the preacher; but he delights to dwell on the other side of the picture, and dilates with generous earnestness on those heroic attributes which in the main characterized the early Protestants, and made them as bold and patient in action as they were sincere in thought. They were men of the world, "wise in their generation," and yet at the same time they were "the children of light." But though ever ready to use appropriate secular means to the furtherance of their ends, ready to accept human instrumentality in carrying on divine work, their ultimate reliance was on the truth as such, on the

invisible hand of God who has scattered its seeds upon the earth and will make it yield a harvest in due season, in spite of indifference and neglect, in spite of the trampling feet of bigotry vainly trying to obliterate the seed as fast as it falls. Truth is adapted for man, and man for the truth, and this will be proved by the *years*, however contradicted by the *days*. Most earnestly does M. Fontanèse teach the lesson of Trust; he would have a spiritual church erected principally by spiritual agencies, repudiating all that is vulgar and selfish. He would inculcate faith in the Divine influences,—those beautiful "things unseen" for ever germinating in the world.

"Erect no palissade or barrier to protect the truth against the enterprize of man. Man can do nothing against the truth, be assured of that; and if you ask for no bayonets to become your sustaining power of social order; if you reckon, for the safety of society, on those instincts of justice and worth, upon the spirit of devotion and respect for duty, which distinguish men from the brutes, do not establish religion and faith upon the tottering foundations of a timid submission. Believe in the truth and in the spirit, and confiding in these invisible powers, do not ridiculously prop the truth upon crutches in order to hold it upright in the world."

Conscious infirmity makes timid thinkers of most of us. We like to feel the backward pull of the anchor chains; we keep to our moorings in dock instead of sailing down the stream of thought into infinite seas. And yet it should be obvious, surely, that only by some boldness in speculation, only by trusting ourselves to deeps unknown, can larger discoveries of truth be made. Awfulness and fear naturally come over every spirit that feels itself afloat on the infinite. But it must be patient and brave. There are not wanting aids and encouragements in the voyage, though the way be long and the waves stormy. If the old landmarks fade from our view with the receding shores, there are still the stars above to guide and cheer. If we have floated far away from the circle in which we were wont to move, and hear the familiar music of its sympathy no more, still we are ever accompanied by hope, and hope is a bird that hovers over waste and wilderness places, and sings loud and sweet even in darkness and storm. Wherever the mind may travel, it is still within the realms of the Almighty, and the awfullest billows of thought, like the waters of ocean, are held in the hollow of his hand.

To apply this feeling of courage and spirit of enterprize to the themes of Christianity, M. Fontanèse regards as the best means of preserving its beautiful essence, and urges upon his hearers to keep their faith an ever-living, moving, fresh and expansive thing:

"You are the children of the faith. Allow not yourselves to be shaken by the sophisms of those who keep watch around ruins. Finish the work of your fathers. The axe of the headsman, the flames of the martyr's pile, have stopped them in the middle of their work; they had not time to pass through the sieve of their criticism all ecclesiastical tradition, and, being pressed, they have transmitted together with the pure gold much of alloy. They did not completely liberate us from the scholasticism in which the gospel disappeared, and the yoke of Tradition and of the Church which they broke was soon replaced by the yoke of the letter. Let us not be unfaithful to their spirit. Let us not barricade ourselves in their formularies, nor refuse to accept the results of scientific research, nor obstinately defend a theology whose base is overturned. Let each one know wherefore he believes and what is necessary for his religious life. Let each prove his faith. Let us be Christians in the spirit.

Through changing forms let us seize on the eternal truth; and under pretext of disarming incredulity, or of avoiding discussion, let us not confound the conventional order, which human indolence fears to disturb, with that healthy movement and that free inquiry which bring into play all the living forces of the soul. The heritage of our fathers is like the talent in the parable; to make it profitable, it must not be buried in the ground; it is not a patent of nobility to be locked up in archives; it is not a formula to be repeated like an article of the civil code. No! it is a spirit; it is a life which must unfold and blossom; it is the breath of God which makes the human soul to vibrate. Hinder not its action; raise up no barriers; for it will have to overturn them. 'Ye have been bought at a great price; be not ye the servants of men.'"

It is to be feared that utterance so bold, sympathy so large, and liberality so genial, as are manifest in this sermon, will expose the preacher to some opposition and reproach from that portion of his friends who think more of the old bottles than the old wine, of the old forms than of the old spirit. But bigotry M. Fontanèse has the temper to bear and the charity to forgive.

E. A.

---

*Unitarianism and Unitarians: or What we are, and What we ought to be.* By John Wright, B.A. 8vo. Pp. 27. London—Whitfield.

*Church-Life? or Sect-Life? A Second Letter to the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, in Reply to the Critics of the First.* By James Martineau.

Large as the subject is on which these interesting pamphlets treat, we find ourselves at the close of a volume, and with a great press of articles claiming insertion, compelled to dismiss them with a very brief notice. Mr. Wright declares himself without reserve an advocate for the *Unitarian* name, as that which best describes the position and the duties of our churches. This is his own very fair summary of his argument:

"If there are a number of individuals or congregations, at the present day, who agree on the great fundamental principles of Religion, let them unite together, on the ground of this agreement. Let them help one another, in applying these principles to their several wants, in seeking to grow, as individuals, into the harmony with God which is the end of their existence. Let them take a name, which will express their doctrinal agreement, without requiring a verbal creed as a symbol of their union. Let them work together to spread religion, by means of the great principles which they hold in common. They will thus form a sect; but let them cultivate kindly feelings and Christian charity with all other sects, whether of Christians or non-Christians, and instead of seeking the Utopia of a 'Universal Christian Church,' free from sects—a thing never yet realized, even in the Apostolic age,—let them be content to recognize their brotherly relation towards that much grander whole, —a universal humanity,—God's one family over all the world.

"If this be done by us, in the present day, without legislating for posterity, there will be no treason committed against our spiritual ancestors, no injustice against our descendants; but there will be, I believe, an opportunity given for an increased fraternal sympathy towards each other, an increased mutual hearty assistance and co-operation, and there will be means afforded for a strenuous common effort to spread our principles among mankind, and to use them to save some of those, who are now suffering spiritual starvation, while we are debating on what principle we ought to feed them."—Pp. 26, 27.

Mr. Wright's "sect-life," thus explained, is, we conceive, the true "church-life" which the gospel seeks to create. To suppress or sub-

ordinate any theological conviction in deference to a craving for a Church Universal, is to tamper with conscience for the sake of a theory. If ever a Church Universal is recognized by all Christians, it must be after Unitarianism has done its work of vindicating God's supreme and sole right to worship, the essential mercifulness of his character, and consequently the equal acceptance of all who approach him in sincerity and live up to their light.

There are one or two passages in his pamphlet in which Mr. Wright pushes on to conclusions which appear to us not essential to his argument, and there are one or two points in which he does not make the limitations and qualifications which we desire in this connection. We should regret to see an attempt to introduce in any of our chapel trust-deeds minute theological definition. We recognize the distinction that obviously exists between a society of worshiping Christians and a class of theological students. The former must have obtained what the latter are seeking—a theological result. We should therefore keep the latter scrupulously free from every preliminary theological test. If the name Unitarian is used in reference to any of our theological academies, it is, we presume, with the historical interpretation of the name, as including not merely faith in the strict unity of God, but also in his infinite goodness, and the right of free inquiry in religion. Historically interpreted, "Unitarianism" means this and more. And here we may remark, that Mr. Martineau, and those who agree with him, commonly take the word "Unitarian" in its etymological limitations, and, starting with a definition unduly narrow, fail to reach a comprehensive conclusion.

There will perhaps be difficulties sometimes arising in Unitarian churches in relation to those who are still inquirers, and are not yet able to throw themselves without doubt and hesitation into schemes of Unitarian action. Let time be given and patience shewn to all such. But their doubts and fears are not to cramp the religious liberty and circumscribe the Unitarian activity of those who have passed on from the outer court of inquiry and doubt into the more privileged abode of conviction and faith. If Mr. Wright means more than this at p. 19, when, answering the question, "What shall we now do?" he speaks of "leaving out all doubters and temporisers," &c., we probably may not agree with him.

Mr. Wright and Mr. Martineau exhibit minds constitutionally differing,—the former is essentially *practical*, the latter always *metaphysical*. For the doubts and difficulties and hesitations of the one, the other in his zeal for action may scarcely exercise the necessary tolerance. On the other hand, Mr. Martineau may go wrong if he seeks to throw the net-work of his own scruples over other men who see their way clear to combined Unitarian action. As an illustration of what we mean, we respect, though we do not adopt, Mr. Martineau's objection to the joint action of the members of a church for Unitarian objects. We willingly receive him as an *individual* supporter of our cause. Is he, under such circumstances, entitled to object (as, if we understand him aright, he does) to other men, who have not his scruples on this point, combining for the same objects *as a church?*

Of Mr. Martineau's second Letter much might be written. He complains that his first Letter has been generally misunderstood, and in no one instance acknowledges that any one of his critics was right. But

although he will not do it, his friends will feel thankful that there were critics who made reply necessary, and that in his second Letter he wisely avoided those expressions which in the first had astonished and pained his Unitarian friends. Those expressions he does not retract, but he to some extent neutralizes them by others of a friendly and conciliatory nature.

In respect to the criticisms on the Strictures which appeared in a former No. of our Magazine, we have to thank him for setting us right as to Mr. Hallam's estimate of Calvin's writings.* The passage inadvertently used by us referred to the other leaders of the Reformation and to the Romish writers, not to Calvin.

Mr. Martineau has in his second Letter jutified to a considerable extent his representation of the opinions of the late Mr. Edgar Taylor. This, it will be remembered, we did not dispute. When he goes on to identify the opinions of the late Mr. Aspland with those of Mr. Taylor, we are morally certain, whatever authority he may have for the statement, that he is mistaken. Mr. Aspland was not the man to persevere in a course into which he had mistakenly entered, but which experience proved was productive of disastrous results. To the last of his public life he continued to give to the Unitarian Association all the aids of his counsel and influence. There was by no means that oneness of opinion between Mr. Edgar Taylor and Mr. Aspland that Mr. Martineau represents. Mr. Martineau might have remembered that to the Aggregate Meeting, which Mr. Taylor disapproved, Mr. Aspland contributed a letter, in which he took upon himself a portion of the responsibility of calling the meeting, and expressed his confidence in its useful results. The advantages anticipated from that meeting were, as Mr. Martineau will doubtless remember, frustrated by a discussion not very unlike the controversy which has grown out of his Letter. From such discussions we anticipate no good to the Unitarian denomination or cause. There is at the present time ample scope for the practical exertions of every earnest and faithful Unitarian, and it is our earnest hope that with one consent both parties in this controversy will cease from strife, and unite in the important work open to them. If we thought it expedient, we could without difficulty shew that, except on the points we have specified, Mr. Martineau's rejoinder to our Strictures entirely fails of the mark. We forbear, however, from an overpowering sense of duty to the Unitarian cause, which we believe all of us can more efficiently serve than by continuing an unproductive and perilous controversy.

---

*Inspiration: how is it related to Revelation and the Reason?* Pp. 63. London—Trübner.

This is one of many essays which the Bampton Lecturer of last year, Mr. Mansel, has called into existence. If the critic has definite opinions on the difficult subject on which he writes, he has scarcely succeeded, we think, in communicating them clearly to his readers.

---

* Some of Mr. Martineau's expressions may be understood to hint that the use of Hallam's words in the *Christian Reformer* was intentionally deceptive. We do not wish, however, to think he intended this; if any man imputes such an intention to us, we shall scarcely be disposed to answer the charge.

*The Relations of Christianity, as we, as a Denomination, understand and accept it, to the higher Intellectual, Moral and Philanthropic Tendencies of our Day; and one of the Causes of our apparent Failure, hitherto, to build up by the Aid of these a "Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church." A Letter to the Churches of the Western Unitarian Christian Union, by the Rev. J. Lettis Short, presented at the Half-yearly Meeting, held at Taunton, on Wednesday, May* 11, 1859, *and published at their Request.* 8vo. Pp. 23. London—Whitfield.

There is good sense in this Address, and plain speaking enough and to spare. The author shews how advantageous and how responsible is our position in being able both to accept truth and moral influence from every possible quarter, and at the same time to shew their congruity with our essential principles. In this animated passage, Mr. Short dwells on the antagonism between orthodoxy and the ideas and principles involved in the philanthropic movements of the day.

"Now that they have touched our human sphere they will soon ascend to the divine. Now that they have demanded that the earthly king shall be humane, and his laws lenient, and his punishments reformatory, they will not be long before they apply the same theories to the King of Kings, to God's laws, and to *Future* Punishments. They have nothing in common with that idea of God which depicts Him as an Imperious Monarch, who finds even a manifestation of His Glory in the everlasting agonies of the damned; nor with that which regards Him as a Pitiless Judge, who demands that the full debt be paid to Him before man can be forgiven; nor with that which imagines Him so Rigorous a Governor that He will not pardon sin without an act of exemplary punishment. They stand in unalterable revolt against the idea of punishment which considers it as a vindictive and an everlasting curse that God reserves for those who pass into the next life without having made their peace with Him; and, against that consequent idea of the consignment of all the race, save one small fraction, to an everlasting hell, where they can no longer help hating, blaspheming, sinning against God for ever. And they are altogether alien from that idea of man which regards him as utterly corrupt; which would have us sit beside him in despair, believing that no thought, no affection, no desire of his soul is good—that there is no germ of godliness within him; and which would, consistently enough, have us simply cry, 'Come, O wind from heaven, and blow upon these dead bones that they may live.'"

Of the way in which Unitarians meet their responsible duties, we think Mr. Short takes an unnecessarily desponding view; but if he succeed in rousing only one man amongst us to a sense of duty—if he inspire one mind with a motive to a higher fidelity, then he is sufficiently vindicated. But, as far as our observation goes, the language of lamentation and depreciation does not often rouse the indolent to duty and effort, though we fear it does sometimes depress and dishearten the naturally timid.

---

*Theodore Parker's Experience as a Minister*, &c. Pp. 128. Whitfield.

Of this interesting but very strange letter, which gives an account of Parker's early life and education for the ministry, and combines therewith a large amount of misrepresentation of the Bible and revealed religion, we cannot now attempt any analysis. We admire the abilities and eloquence of Theodore Parker, we honour his sterling virtues, and we proportionally lament that he is not an unhesitating disciple of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. We hope to return to the subject shortly.

# INTELLIGENCE.

## PROVINCIAL MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION.

An important and influential meeting was held on Friday, Nov. 18th, in Cross-Street chapel room, Manchester, to consider the desirableness of forming a District Association in connection with the Missionary Branch of the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire. Among those present were Ivie Mackie, Esq. (Mayor of Manchester), Messrs. J. M'Connel, H. J. Leppoc, B. Heape, P. Eckersley, C. Grundy, A. Winterbottom, R. D. Darbishire, S. Hollins, H. Rawson, T. Diggles, W. Boardman, J. Booth, and Revds. Dr. Beard, C. Robberds, G. H. Wells and M. Gibson.

Rev. W. GASKELL, having been called to the chair, stated the circumstances which led to the meeting. Most of the gentlemen, he said, would be aware that at the meeting of the Provincial Assembly, held at Dukinfield the year before last, he had brought forward a plan of missionary action, suggested by Mr. Henry Bright, of Liverpool. He had done this with some reluctance, because he knew, if the plan was favourably received, it would be sure to entail upon him additional work, of which he had sufficient already; but he felt so strongly the necessity for some such plan being adopted, that he could not conscientiously refuse to give what help he was able in recommending it and preparing to carry it out. The manner in which the plan was met by the Assembly, shewed to what a large and unhoped-for extent his own feeling was shared by both laymen and ministers. A Committee was appointed to consider the plan, and, after undergoing certain modifications which removed the objections of some who had before been opposed to it, it was again submitted to the last meeting of the Assembly at Chester, when it was sanctioned by a large majority, and a Committee chosen to bring it into operation. At the first meeting, the Bury and East Cheshire District Associations had been received into union, and a grant of £40 made to the former in aid of an effort which it was about to make for the establishment of a congregation at Blackburn. This afforded an illustration of one of the modes in which the Missionary Branch proposed to work. Each local Association would have its own sphere of labour and provide the means requisite for its own particular use, and also render what help it could to the General Fund, which would thus be enabled to meet the wants of special cases. Each Association would have its own Committee for the transaction of its own business, and at the same time be in connection with the General Committee, and have a share in its deliberations. There would thus be the advantage of combined action with that of individual freedom. As he had mentioned, the Bury and East Cheshire Associations were already at work, and there was every probability that two others would soon be formed, with Liverpool and Bolton for their centres. Another would be needed for the Manchester district, and would certainly be established. The only question was, whether they were prepared to make it as strong as it should be, and to work it with vigour and efficiency. They had been sadly too supine and indifferent, and afforded too much reason for that storm of pitiless contempt which their orthodox brethren were directing against them and their efforts. He trusted they were about to turn over a new leaf, and shew by unmistakable proofs that they had the true life in them. He believed that there was now a tide in their affairs which, taken at the flood, would lead them on to fortune, and that if they refused to take advantage of it, they would be untrue to themselves and untrue to the great cause which they had confided to them.

The first resolution, moved by the Mayor of Manchester, was, "That a Manchester District Unitarian Association be formed in connection with the Missionary Branch of the Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire." He said his presence there was a proof how much he had the matter at heart, as he had left important business in which he was engaged at the Town-hall in order to shew his interest in it. He had long thought, with the Chairman, that they had not done what they ought to have done for that which they believed to be the cause of religious truth, and he had brought the subject forward not only in season, but, as some fancied, out of season too. He felt under the deepest obligations to Unitarianism himself, and he was anxious that others should have the benefit of it likewise. While he valued it because of its reasonableness, he felt that it was a religion for the heart as well as for the head. As it seemed to him, the question between them and other sects was not a mere question of Trinity and Unity, but one immediately affecting the character of God. The other night he had been looking over again the Assembly's Catechism, and he had been more struck than ever with

the darkness in which it wrapped the Divine mercy and love. While other denominations were nearly all of them making progress, the Unitarians for some time appeared to have been standing still. He believed that the plan now proposed was likely to help in advancing it to the position which it ought to occupy, and he therefore gave it his hearty support, in proof of which he was ready to become an annual subscriber of £20 for a few years, until it should be completely established.

In seconding the motion, Dr. BEARD said this was a happy day for him—a day to which he had for a long time looked forward. Some excuse for the short-comings to which reference had been made might be found in the fact, that till lately there had been a want of suitable agents for the work which required to be done. That want, however, the Home Missionary Board was now prepared to supply. His connection with that Institution afforded him good opportunities of becoming acquainted with the state of feeling among the intelligent portion of the working classes, and he felt more deeply than ever the responsibility which was laid upon Unitarian Christians to make better known their own simple views of the gospel. He would take no part in spreading a merely controversial theology, but he did think that they were bound, to the utmost of their ability, to help in diffusing around them what they held to be God's truth. He then referred in an interesting manner to the past history of the Manchester Village Missionary Society, shewing how it had been the means of establishing thriving congregations at Oldham, Swinton, Padiham and Rawtenstall, and drawing from this encouragement to more extended effort of a similar kind.

Mr. LEPPOC moved, "That the objects of the Association shall be, to render aid where needed to existing churches, and to help in founding new ones." While completely approving of these objects, he forcibly urged on the meeting the necessity of taking care that institutions already in existence, such as the Fellowship Fund and the Mission to the Poor, did not suffer for want of proper support. There was no need that they should, if so wealthy a body as the Unitarians of Manchester were only did their duty.

Rev. G. H. WELLS seconded the motion, and said that, the objections which he in the first instance felt to the plan having now been removed, he gave in his complete adhesion to it, and should be ready to take his share in rendering it successful.

On the motion of Mr. HEAPE, seconded by Mr. BOARDMAN, it was resolved, "That all churches shall be considered as belonging to the Association which make an annual collection in aid of its objects."

Mr. DIGGLES moved, and Mr. ECKERSLEY seconded, "That in addition to such annual collections, means be taken to obtain individual subscriptions and donations."

Mr. M'CONNEL proposed, and Mr. BOOTH seconded, "That the working of the Association shall be entrusted to a Committee, annually appointed at a general meeting to be held in Manchester."

And lastly, on the motion of Mr. RAWSON, seconded by Mr. W. ASHWORTH, it was resolved, "That the gentlemen present shall constitute such Committee for the ensuing year, with power to add to their number."

This is only a meagre outline of the proceedings of a very successful meeting, the tone of which was excellent throughout; and we sincerely trust that the work which has been begun with so much spirit will be carried on with equal vigour.

---

### UNITARIAN YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION, BELFAST.

The annual meeting of this Association was held on Tuesday, Oct. 25th. The attendance was large, numbering about 300. Among the ministers present were—Revds. C. J. M'Alister, J. Scott Porter, John Porter, W. Crozier, D. Maginnis, F. M'Cammon and Mr. Macdonald. W. J. C. Allen, Esq., President of the Association, occupied the chair. Of the interesting speeches delivered, we have only space for the following:

After the Treasurer's account had been read,

Mr. HERBERT DARBISHIRE moved the adoption of the Secretary's report and the Treasurer's account. They were so intimately connected in the question of finance that he should consider them together rather than separately. The Secretary's report was highly satisfactory, inasmuch as it shewed the steady progress which the Association had made during the past year, and he considered this was a convincing proof of its vitality. It often happened, when our societies were formed, that there existed at first much fever and interest, which soon died out; but such had not been the case with this Association, which had gradually but steadily increased its numbers, until it now comprised 223 members, being an increase of 58 during the past year. The Treasurer's account might also be considered satisfactory, as it shewed that the Society had been able to provide for fourteen months' ordinary expenditure out of a twelvemonth's income.

Still he must say that the subscriptions were too small. A considerable difference of opinion had existed when the Association was formed, as to whether the minimum of subscription should be 2*s.* 6*d.* or 5*s.*; but the majority were of opinion, and he shared in that opinion, that no one should be debarred from becoming a member through want of means. The very small sum, therefore, of 2*s.* 6*d.* had been fixed as the minimum; but he must say that on looking over the list of subscribers, he saw many members down for that sum who he thought were very well able to give more, and he therefore entreated his fellow-members to increase their subscriptions as much as possible, so as thus to aid the Committee by all the pecuniary means which lay in their power.

A feature highly gratifying to the Committee, during the past year, had been the introduction of many young men who had come to settle in Belfast, and he would earnestly request the ministers of neighbouring congregations, of whom he saw several around him, to remember the existence of the Young Men's Association, so that when any of their young flock were about to leave them, they might be brought under its notice. It was lamentable to think of the many young men who had been lost to the Unitarian body during the last few years, from the non-existence of such a means of being kept together as this Association afforded.

Their President had expressed a hope in his beautiful address that their proceedings this evening would be entirely harmonious. For his (Mr. Darbishire's) part, he entertained no fear whatever, and he spoke from past experience. When this Association was first started, as every one present would remember, considerable difference of opinion was expressed in reference to the name which it should assume. It was eventually decided by a considerable majority, and he rejoiced to say it, that the Association should be called, "Unitarian." Unitarians they were, and so long as they were so, let them stand by that honoured yet much maligned name. It was feared by many that this difference of opinion would lead to the dismemberment of the Association. He (Mr. D.) had never shared in this fear; he had too much confidence in the good feeling, the earnestness, the Christian spirit, of his fellow-members, to have any such fear. And he was right; for never since that question was settled had he heard one word of dissatisfaction, and scarcely one of disappointment, expressed; on the contrary, every one seemed anxious to remember how, on all subjects of importance, he was of one mind with his fellow-associates; and he might indeed say that they had ever been unanimous in joining hand and heart for the good of the common cause. During this time there has been much discussion, both in Belfast and in England, on subjects intimately affecting Unitarianism. With all this, the Unitarian Young Men's Christian Association has taken nothing whatever to do. It has gone on its own course calmly, steadily, nobly; and he would therefore claim for it, from all earnest Unitarians, every possible support, encouragement, approval—he was not afraid to add, every possible honour. He concluded by moving the adoption of the Secretary's report and the Treasurer's account.

---

LONDON DISTRICT UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

On the evening of Wednesday, Nov. 23, a large meeting of this Society was held at Radley's Hotel, under the able presidency of Rev. Henry Ierson. The subject introduced, in a remarkably interesting speech by Mr. J. C. Lawrence, was the recent Irish Revival. Without committing himself to the defence of the extravagances and excesses which had grown out of the religious excitement in Belfast, Mr. Lawrence said he felt compelled, by the evidence adduced, to think it possible that a really great work was going on, and although the time had not yet arrived for a final judgment on the matter, he hoped it would be discussed by the friends before him with temper and charity, and that no harsh censures would be cast on the men engaged in the movement now going on, which might be directed by the finger of God. A very long and exciting discussion ensued. Rev. W. H. Black combatted on theological grounds the idea of sudden conversions effected after the mode of the Irish revival. Mr. J. H. Preston expressed his total disbelief in the reality of the revival, and read extracts from a letter from the scene of the movement, stating that the agitation had not led in any cases to permanent moral reformation, that crime had not diminished, and that the most obvious effect of the revival was an increase of wild lunatics. Rev. J. C. Means vindicated the revival on Scripture grounds, and stated his views on the doctrine of the Spirit. Many interesting speeches were delivered by Mr. Hammond, Mr. Hill, Mr. Addiscott, and others. At the call of the meeting, Rev. James Martineau supported the views of Mr. Lawrence and Mr. Means by an elaborate speech on the doctrine of the Spirit, in which he expressed his utter disbelief in second causes, and his conviction that the Spirit of God was at work even

in religious movements which led to only partial good, such as the revival of Monotheism by Mahomet, &c. Rev. R. B. Aspland expressed his regret that the discussion had assumed so largely a theoretical and philosophical character. What they wanted was fact, not theory. It would be time enough to philosophize on this alleged revival when its reality and permanence were proved. So far as the evidence was before him, he was compelled to look on the revival as factitious and deceptive. He deplored the scenes lately enacted in Ireland, calculated to degrade Protestantism and religion generally. In getting up exhibitions professedly supernatural like those recently going on in Belfast, the Catholics could always surpass their Protestant neighbours. Mr. Lawrence in a brief speech combatted the objections which had been stated to the reality of the revival. Mr. Ierson spoke some words of counsel and gentle rebuke, and the meeting closed, after a three hours' debate, with prayer offered by Rev. J. Panton Ham.

---

MANSFIELD.

The usual half-yearly meeting of the Unitarian ministers of the Midland District was held at Mansfield on Tuesday, Nov. 8. A theological subject previously agreed upon was, according to the usage of the Society, discussed, and the party dined together at the house of the minister of the place. The Mansfield congregation, taking advantage of the presence of the ministers, held in the evening a public social tea-meeting in their commodious and well-furnished school-room. Rev. A. W. Worthington occupied the chair, and spoke in cheering and encouraging terms of the earnest spirit which he had found in his congregation, adding some remarks on the duties devolving upon Christian churches in their corporate capacity. Rev. R. L. Lloyd, of Belper, as the Secretary of the North-Midland Missionary Association, spoke of the plans and operations of that Society. Rev. T. W. Elliott, of Ilkeston, one of the missionaries of the Association, and lately a Baptist minister at Market Harborough, gave an interesting account of his religious experience, and the reasons that had compelled him to renounce orthodoxy and embrace Unitarianism. Rev. Wm. Newton, of Hinckley, spoke on the Christian Catholic church of the past, the present and the future. Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield, addressed the meeting on the various phases of Unitarianism in the United States of America. Rev. Wm. Birks, of Flagg, gave some account of Unitarianism in the Derbyshire Peak district, and adverted to his own experience as a former preacher of Trinitarianism, and the trials he passed through, before the light of a purer faith completely dawned upon his mind. Rev. John James Bishop, B.A., of Loughborough, enforced the claims of Sunday-schools, and dwelt on the importance of ever keeping their high religious purpose in view. Mr. Vallance and Mr. Manley, of Mansfield, also took part in the proceedings. The meeting, which was characterized by a warm and friendly spirit, was closed with singing and prayer.

F. B.

---

OPENING OF THE GREAT-MEETING SCHOOL-BUILDINGS AT LEICESTER.

On the evening of Wednesday, Nov. 16, the members of the Great Meeting met in large numbers to celebrate the opening of the new school-house. In its design it is of the early English style, and consists of two large school-rooms, with four large class-rooms, and accommodation for infants. The cost of the schools, including the purchase of land and the adjoining property, is upwards of £1800. Towards that sum above £1200 has been raised by voluntary effort.—The meeting was held in the upper or girls' school-room, which was beautifully decorated; festoons of evergreens, interspersed with mottoes and texts of scripture, being around the walls, which were also adorned with paintings and engravings, busts and statuary, lent by members of the congregation. A delightful evening was passed, interspersed with addresses and music. The presence of their late venerated pastor, Rev. Charles Berry, who gave an interesting historical sketch of the Great-Meeting congregation, added much to the pleasure of the evening. Mr. Clephan read an account of the rise and progress of the school. Rev. C. C. Coe also spoke, and with much effect. Of Mr. Berry's narrative we hope to make use hereafter in an extended account of the liberal Nonconformity of Leicester.

---

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. CHAS. WELLBELOVED.

It is with no small satisfaction that we are authorized to announce that a Memoir of this excellent man is about to be committed to the press. When we add that it is from the pen of his son-in-law, the Rev. John Kenrick, our readers will have every assurance that the work will be of enduring interest, and will do lasting honour to the memory of one whose meek

wisdom all of our own faith, and many of other religious communions, concur to praise. The work will be printed in the same form as Mr. Wellbeloved's Memoir of Captain Thrush. It may be expected to appear early in the new year.

---

YORKSHIRE PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.

The monthly meeting of this Society was held on Tuesday last, at the Museum, York, the Rev. CANON HARCOURT in the chair.

*The Wellbeloved Memorial.*

F. W. CALVERT, Esq., read the report of the Committee relative to the Memorial from the friends of the late Rev. C. Wellbeloved, which was as follows:

"It will be in the recollection of the members that a Committee was appointed at the annual meeting of the Society in February last, to raise subscriptions, and provide a permanent Memorial and acknowledgment of the eminent and lengthened services of the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, in the cause of archæology and literature, and more especially as curator of antiquities to this Society. The Committee have the satisfaction to report that a very liberal and ready response was made to their appeal for subscriptions, and the sum of £63. 16*s.* 6*d.* was ultimately placed at the disposal of the Committee for the contemplated Memorial. After carefully considering the best mode of carrying out the wishes of the subscribers, the Committee came to the conclusion that a Portrait of their late revered friend would be esteemed the most satisfactory and suitable Memorial; and having ascertained that the only Portrait of him in existence was in the possession of his former pupil and friend, W. R. Wood, Esq., of Singleton Lodge, near Manchester, that gentleman, being applied to, at once placed the Portrait at the disposal of the Committee. Mr. Chester Earles, an eminent artist, was then selected to paint the copy, and the Committee have the satisfaction to report that a spirited and faithful likeness of the original has been executed. With the consent of the Council, it is intended to be placed in the vestibule of the Museum, along with the Portrait of the late James Atkinson, Esq., his talented friend and fellow-labourer in the service of the Society. The subscriptions being found adequate, the Committee further determined to erect a Marble Tablet, with a suitable inscription, which has been satisfactorily executed by Messrs. Skelton and Son, sculptors, and placed over the entrance-door of the upper room of the Hospitium, where are deposited those numerous and unrivalled specimens of Roman and other antiquities, in illustrating which he so much delighted and excelled. The following is the inscription on the tablet: 'This tablet is erected by members of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society and other friends of the late Rev. Charles Wellbeloved, to commemorate his long and varied services as curator of antiquities; the learning and research with which he illustrated the History of Roman York and the remains of St. Mary's Abbey, and the skill and taste with which he arranged and described the antiquarian collections of this Museum. MDCCCLIX.' A considerable balance still remaining in hand, the Committee, through the kind co-operation of the Rev. J. Kenrick, were enabled, at the recent sale of Mr. Wellbeloved's library, to secure for the Society his well-known and valuable copies of Horsley's Britannia Romana and Drake's Eboracum. This copy of Drake has been ably illustrated by Mr. Cade, who was a native of Darlington, and spent the latter part of his life at Gainford. He was an eminent antiquary, and being confined to his bed for many years by a complication of the most painful disorders by which a man can be afflicted, he amused himself by illustrating various historical and topographical works, of which Drake's appear to have been one. They were presented by him to a gentleman to whom he owed obligations, and by him were sold during Cade's lifetime. Mr. Wellbeloved purchased this copy at the sale of the late Mr. Eustachius Strickland's library, and has made many marginal notes and manuscript additions to it. It now only remains for the Committee, in the name of the subscribers, to present to the Yorkshire Philosophical Society these interesting memorials of the author of 'The History of St. Mary's Abbey,' and 'York under the Romans,' whose devoted labours, extensive learning, and high literary attainments were so long and cheerfully placed at the disposal of the Society,—who so anxiously watched over and fostered its early youth,—and whose delight was to promote and devolop its usefulness and prosperity."

It was resolved unanimously that the very interesting document which had just been read be entered on the minutes of the Society.

Rev. J. KENRICK, as a near connection of the deceased, expressed the gratification of his relatives at the spontaneous and very liberal manner in which the means had been provided of placing this permanent Memorial within the walls of an Institution to which the services of Mr. Wellbeloved were devoted.—*York Herald*, Nov. 5.

# OBITUARY.

Sept. 16, at Hull, Mr. William Till, aged 71 years. The deceased when a young man embraced Unitarian Christianity from conviction, and was a consistent and zealous professor of its principles for fifty years. In his earlier years he worshiped at Gainsborough chapel, but he is better known by his connection with the Doncaster congregation, of which he was an active member for thirty-six years. "His end was peace;" and his kind, cheerful and conciliatory disposition won for him throughout life the esteem and affection of all who knew him.

---

Oct. 28, William Browne, Esq., of Bridgewater, in the 69th year of his age; and to a thoughtful observer of ordinary business life in this country, the progress of very few will be found to suggest more instructive or encouraging matter for reflection.

Mr. Browne was descended from a respectable, middle-class Dissenting family long settled at Dulverton, in Somersetshire, his father having been the first who removed (about the year 1780) from thence to Bridgewater, where he became a member of the Baptist congregation then holding a moderately Calvinistic creed; but after a diligent perusal and much earnest consideration of the sacred writings, gradually adopted Unitarian views and joined the congregation assembling in Christ Church chapel, of which the late Rev. John Tingcombe was at that time the minister.

The requirements of a numerous family and limited income caused an early entrance by his three sons on the labours and duties of active life. George, the eldest, betook himself to the naval service, in which he attained honourable distinction; whilst the second and third (William and John) zealously applied themselves to business; the former speedily obtaining a prominent and confidential position in the bank of Messrs. Sealy and Sons, which he held several years.

In 1816, he removed to Bristol to become the managing partner of his mother's relative, the late Mr. Parsons, in his long-established business as a bookseller and stationer in Clare Street, where he remained nearly twenty-six years, during which period he distinguished himself as a most valuable and useful member of the Lewin's-Mead congregation, officiating for ten years with eminent efficiency as Secretary to the Western Unitarian Society, and evincing on various occasions such unusual capacity for the undertakings of active life, that his subsequent removal from Bristol was justly and generally regarded as a public loss.

This took place in 1842; but he had for some years before gradually paid increasing attention to the more important mercantile and manufacturing business established by his brother John at Bridgewater, in which he had become individually interested from the year 1830, and to which he henceforth devoted himself with that unwearying energy for which his whole life was remarkable.

But this energy was not of that restricted character which regards mere gain as its object; for whilst ceaselessly diligent in the superintendence of his own affairs, perhaps an equal share of his attention was directed to the advancement of popular education, of civil and religious freedom, of the elevation of the industrial classes, of sanitary improvement,—and, in short, of every effort in which he was enabled to participate for promoting the welfare of those around him. Witness the provision made by him for the preservation of cleanliness, comfort, and domestic propriety, in the new dwelling-houses which he erected in Provident Place, with the further accommodation of a well-arranged school-house, built by himself and his brother John;—witness the zeal, perseverance, and ability, with which he accomplished, notwithstanding great discouragement at its commencement, the institution of Building Societies—his liberal support of schools apparently in rivalry with his own—his generous help of a public exhibition in aid of funds for repairing and beautifying the parish church, and the munificent hospitality with which, during his Mayoralty, he entertained the Bishop and Clergy of the diocese at its re-opening.

With this alacrity in the promotion of every object of public utility was combined such consistent humility and modesty of demeanour, and such a total absence of the slightest indication of self-assumption, as rendered his good deeds doubly attractive and influential.

In the intercourses of domestic life he was singularly genial, amiable, and unselfish; ever attentive to the comfort and claims of others, and remarkably exempt from those minor infirmities of temper by which the personal qualities of many really *good* men are not unfrequently overshadowed.

His indefatigable industry was rewarded by an ample competence, and his excellence as a husband and father by the devoted love of every member of his family,

and by the gratification of seeing the satisfactory settlement in marriage of each of his four daughters.

Lastly, his end was peace,—every symptom of pain having entirely ceased, and his latest breath having in quiet slumber passed inaudibly.

At his interment, the fervent and grateful testimony of all classes was borne to his universally-acknowledged worth. On this occasion the funeral train was spontaneously headed by the Mayor and Corporation, of which Mr. Browne had been an Alderman. Every shop in the streets through which it passed to the cemetery was half closed, and every vessel in the harbour carried her flag at half-mast. Five mourning carriages were filled with his children, their husbands and near relatives. A numerous body of his fellow-townsmen followed in order, and a still greater number of workmen in the employ of the deceased's firm, closed the procession.

The burial-service was performed in a most impressive and affecting manner by Rev. Wm. James, of Bristol, who had for many years enjoyed the intimate friendship of Mr. Browne; and at its conclusion he was laid in his honoured grave amidst the tears and regrets of hundreds,—bequeathing to the young such an example, to those in middle life such an incitement to the discharge of duty, and to the aged such consolation and warning, as none but the truly excellent of the earth are privileged to leave behind them.

---

Oct. 31, at Edgbaston, near Birmingham, in the 21st year of his age, Thomas Edmund Ryland, eldest son of the late Mr. Frederick Ryland, surgeon, of Birmingham, and grandson of the late Thomas Clark, Esq., of Lady Wood. The premature decease of this excellent young man has plunged in grief a wide circle of relatives and friends, by whom he was affectionately regarded, and one of whom thus feelingly expresses the general sentiments which the sad event has called forth: "I call to mind," says the writer, "all his endearing, excellent qualities, the earnest way in which he commenced the work of life, promising to become an ornament to the medical profession and a useful member of society; but a different path was marked out for him; a higher destiny awaited him; a nobler work was appointed him; and whilst we mourn his loss, we must feel comfort in the thought that he is at rest in a world where sorrow and pain cannot enter." Before the serious illness which, after little more than a week's duration, terminated his brief and promising career, he had entered with zeal and diligence on the course of study necessary to qualify him for the successful practice of that arduous profession in which his father had acquired a high and deserved reputation; and the progress he had already made gave assurance to his family and friends that, had his life been spared, he would have attained to considerable eminence therein; but "God's will be done!"

T. C.

---

Nov. 11, at his residence, 23, Clifton Park, Birkenhead, aged 71, Julius Mott, Esq., after an illness of only two days.

# MARRIAGES.

Sept. 11, at the Old meeting-house, Bessel's Green, by Rev. George Haigh, Mr. Henry Giles, of Riverhead, to Jane, daughter of Mr. John Cowlard, of Chipstead.

Sept. 14, at the Brixton Unitarian chapel, by Rev. Dr. Harrison, Alexandre Dupuis, of Havre, to Eliza, youngest daughter of the late Charles Martineau, Esq., of Tulse Hill.

Sept. 14, at Mottram in Longdendale, Cheshire, Alfred K. Sidebottom, Esq., of Whitegates, Mottram, to Mary, second daughter of William Bayley, Esq., of Stamford Lodge, Stalybridge.

Sept. 21, at St. James's church, Clapham Park, London, by Rev. J. G. Collinson, John Alexander, third son of the late James Bremner, Esq., of Aspull and of Manchester, to Jane, only surviving daughter of Abel Harrison, Esq., of Highfield, Stalybridge.

Sept. 22, at the Unitarian chapel, Belper, by Rev. Rees L. Lloyd, Mr. William Booth to Miss Ann Simpson, both of Swanwick, near Alfreton.

Oct. 1, at the New meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. S. Bache, Mr. J. R. Chirm, Jun., to Emma, youngest daughter of the late Mr. W. Preston, of High Street.

Oct. 11, at Christchurch chapel, Bridgwater, by Rev. T. C. Holland, Rev. Thos. Holland, B.A., minister of Christchurch chapel, to Rebecca, only daughter of E. Murch, Esq., of Bridgwater.

Oct. 12, at the Great Meeting, Leicester, by Rev. Charles Berry, Rev. Charles C. Coe, minister of the chapel, to Elizabeth Jessie, daughter of the late Mr. John Cooper, of Birstale, Leicestershire.

# GENERAL INDEX.


Abolition of political services in Book of Common Prayer, 243.
Acts of the Apostles, remarks on the, 101, 138, 223, 266.
Advertisement on "Pure Christianity," 703.
Aikin, Dr., of Warrington, 354.
Ainsworth's, Mr., speech at Cleator, 47.
American slavery, 721.
Andrews, Rev. Robert, 282.
Anniversaries, London Unitarian, 380.
Apocalypse of John, authorship of, 741.
Armstrong, Rev. George, Memoir of, 634.
Aspland, Rev. R., and the Unitarian Association, 617, 754.
Atheism, 133.
Atonement, Discourses on the, 492.
Australia, religion in South, 298, 575.

B. on science and religion, 86. On the edition of the N. T. Codex Vaticanus, 449.
Bacon, Lord, apothegm of, 85.
Baptist, General, meetings, 436.
"Baptize," on the word, 41, 111.
Barker, Mr. Joseph, on Unitarians, 189.
Barnabas, the evangelist, 138.
Baur on the Acts, 104.
Beard, Dr., on Unitarian missionary effort, 212. On Self-culture, 497.
Beard, Rev. C., speeches of, 115, 124. His Outlines of Christian Doctrine, 385.
Belfast Unitarian Society, debates in the, 497.
Belfast Young Men's Christian Association, 756.
Bible, chronology of the, 91.
Bible Society and "Socinians," 412.
Bickersteth's, Mr., controversy with Dr. Sadler, 336.
Birch, Mr. Robert, of Birch chapel, 278.
Birmingham Brotherly Society, 252.
Black's, Mr., speech, 53.
Bolton District Unitarian Society, 379, 696.
Bourn family, 72.
Bowring, Sir John, scriptural hymns by, 624, 676, 720. Correspondence with Rev. G. Armstrong, 635. Speeches at Moreton Hampstead, 698, 700.
Bramwell's, Judge, idea of "grace," 598.
Bridge-Street, Manchester, Sunday-school meeting, 252.
Briggs, Rev. T. B. W., testimonial to, 187.
Bright's, Mr. H. A., Prize at Unitarian Missionary Board, 127. Correction of an error by, 564.
Bristol juryman and the Judge, 593.
British and Foreign schools, religious teaching in, 113. Society, 381.
British Quarterly Review, 370, 694.
Bunsen, Baron, 371. On Channing, 557.
Bruce's, Mr., Letters of Charles I., 241.
Byron, MS. note of, in Childe Harold, 367.

Calvin, John, 276—and Servetus, 374.
Canterbury, meeting at, 571.
Carmarthen Presbyterian Academy examination, 506.
Carpenter's Tunes for the Christian Church and Home, 247.
Chadwick's Life of De Foe, 308.
Channing, Dr., letter to Mr. Armstrong, 637. Described by Bunsen, 557.
Charles I.'s Letters to Henrietta Maria, 241.
Checkley, Rev. George, 283.
Cheshire church agreement in 1689, 744.
Chester, Provincial Meeting at, 498.
Christian Witness and Unitarianism, 525.
Christianity, Shelley's Essay on, 660.
Clark's, Thomas, Essay on Surnames, 637.
Clarke's, Rev. H., religious experience, 513.
Clayden's sermon on the Unitarian Position, 692.
Cleator, presentation at, 47. Preachers and subjects, 575.
Coquerel's Religious Aspects of the Arts, 1. Christology, 165, 193.

Cornelius, conversion of, 141.
"Covenant" or "Testament"? 548, 627, 691.
Creation, Bible history of, 93.
Cromwell's, Dr., Soul and Future Life, 461.
Cropper, Rev. J., presentation to, 60.
Cruelties on the High Seas, 375.

Darbishire, Mr., in correction of Mr. Thom, 564.
Darbishire, Mr. Herbert, speech of, 757.
David and Goliath, lines on, 468.
Davy's, Sir Humphry, Fragmentary Remains, 306.
Dawson, Rev. Mr., of Idle, 352.
Death, scientific conclusions respecting, 96.
Deluge, scientific conclusions on the, 92.
Dennys' Alpha, reviewed, 305.
De Wette on the Canonical Books of the New Testament, 494.
Doubts, momentary, 629.
Dorchester, orthodoxy and charity, 58. Lectures at, 128, 185.
Dukinfield, social meeting at, 123.

Eastern Unitarian Christian Society, 310.
Edwards, Jonathan, on Free-will, 322.
Ellis's Madagascar, 397.
Endowed Schools' Bill, 435.
Enfield, Dr., 354.
England's greatness, 600.
English Lawyer on Slavery, 721.
Essex-Street chapel, 185.
Evans, Rev. John, author of the Ponderer, 66.
Evidences of Christianity, the slighters of, 748.
Ewald's theory of Christ's non-resurrection, 577, 705.
Exhortation, lines on, 591.

Female vanity, preaching against, dangerous, 148.
Field, Mr. E. W., on Newbury chapel, 175.
Finch, Mr., of Platt chapel, 277.
Finch, Mr. Henry, 279.
Fishermen of Galilee, successor of, 137.
Fontanèse's Sermon at Havre on the Reformation, 749.
Fox, Rev. George, ordination of, 251.
Fox, C. J., recollections of, 632.
French Protestantism, tercentenary, 253, 435.
Friendly Disputants, reviewed, 307.
Fullagar, Rev. J., on Mr. W. Turner, 431.

Gaskell, Rev. W., Funeral Sermon for Mr. Wellbeloved, 40. Speech at Manchester, 756.
Gee Cross, annual tea-party at, 124.
Glasgow University, 358.
"God-man," an irreverent title, 367.
Godwin, Mary, Shelley's second wife, 662.
Good preaching, 432.
Gordon, Rev. J., an incident in his religious history, 119. Speech of, 124.
Grace, doctrines of, a sermon on Titus ii. 11—15, 693.
Green, Rev. H., on Presbyterian and Unitarian chapels, 744.

H. H., E., on the doctrines of Grace, 593.
Hallam, Mr., on Locke, 239.
Ham's, Rev. J. P., farewell service at Manchester, 309.
Hampson, Mr. William, 688.
Harrop, Rev. Robert, 684.
Hawkes, Mr., on British and Foreign schools, 113.
Hawkes', Rev. H., address at Southampton, 568.
Henrietta Maria, queen of Chas. I., 241.
Henry, Matthew, testimonial, 55.
Hesketh, Rev. Robert, 282, 367.
Hewley suit, 23.
Heywood, Capt. Peter, 234.
Higginson's, Mr. and Mrs., Translation of Coquerel, 1.
Hincks, Rev. T., tribute to Mr. Wellbeloved's character, 31. Sermon before Unitarian Association, 437. Three Lectures, reviewed, 492.
Hinckley Great Meeting, 383.
Hinton, Mr., on the proem of John, 538.
Hogg's Life of Shelley, 655.
Holland, Rev. Philip, 352.
Hook's, Dr., Church Dictionary, 298.
Horner, Mr. Leonard, on the sediments of the Nile, 92.
Houghton, Rev. John, 282.
Humboldt and the Church, 469.
Hutton, Rev. J. H., sermon at Chester, 498, 555. Resignation of his pulpit, 549. Sermons on the Nature and Office of Christ, 677.
Hypothesis, 654.

Improved Version of the New Testament, 514.
Innovations in Scotch Presbyterian worship, 433.
Inspiration, how is it related to Revelation and the Reason? 754.
Israel, ten tribes of, 601.

John, chronology of Christ's ministry from, 110. Proem to his Gospel, 538.
Jubilee school, Newcastle, 364, 565.

Kell's, Rev. E., tribute to Mr. Tagart's memory, 77, 84. Account of Mrs. M. Story, 200. Address at Southampton, 567.
Kenrick's, Rev. John, address to students of Manchester New College, 424. Speech at the Unitarian Association, 429.

Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association, 571.
Knutsford chapel, re-opening of, 311. Early trust-deed, 744.
Krause, Pastor, on Humboldt, 469.

Lancashire Sunday-school festivities, 511.
Lee, Dr. Robert, and the Presbytery of Edinburgh, 248, 376, 433.
Leicester, opening of school-rooms at, 759.
Library of Biblical Literature, 247.
Lindsey, Rev. Theophilus, 354.
Lines on last day of 1858, 173.
Literary Society at Newcastle established, 361.
Lloyd, Rev. John, ordination of, 700.
Locke, John, 237.
London District Unitarian Society, 60, 444, 758.
London Auxiliary Sunday-School Association, 60.
Luke, author of the Acts, 103, 266.

Macdonald's, Rev. S. F., sermon on Matthew Henry, 55. Removal, 383. On the Unitarian Position controversy, 747. Do your Best, 408. Exhortation, 591.
Maclellan, Rev. R. E. B., at Canterbury, 572.
Madagascar, Ellis's Three Visits to, 397.
Madge's, Rev. Thomas, Farewell Sermon, 253, 496. Funeral Sermon for Rev. E. Tagart, 82. On the Unitarian name, 621.
Manchester New College, annual meeting of Trustees, 114. Annual examination, 446. And Rev. W. Turner, 415, 425. Inaugural address, 642, 701.
Manchester Model Secular School, 180.
Manchester District Sunday-School Association, 312.
Manchester Domestic Mission, 697.
Mansfield, 759.
Marriages, 64, 192, 315, 383, 448, 512, 576, 640, 704, 762.
Martineau, Rev. J., speech at Portland-Street chapel, 185. On the College examination, 491, 560. Letter on the Unitarian Position and strictures thereon, 603. Second Letter, 752.
Materialism, doctrine of, 462.
Maurice's, Mr. M., sketch of Rev. C. Wallace, 687.
May, Rev. S. J., of Syracuse, 574, 699, 701, 721.
Meanley, Rev. Richard, 283.
Means, Rev. J. C., on the Acts of the Apostles, 101, 138, 223, 266. On the word "Baptize," 111. Review of Ellis's Madagascar, 397.
Melbourne Unitarian church, 311.
Mercer, Captain, on Unitarianism in India, 695.
Ministerial removals, 383.
Ministers' Benevolent Society, 700.
Missionary effort, reason for, 212.
Moderation sometimes preferred to truth, 299.
Montgomery, Rev. J. K., 383.
Mossley, ordination at, 251.
Mother's influence, 245.

National Review, 181.
National Reviewer of Ewald criticised, 577, 705.
New Creation, Treatise on the, 342, 664, 730.
Newbury Trustees, defence of, 121. Mr. Field on, 175.
Newcastle congregation, invitation to Mr. Turner, 359. Anniversary of Church of Divine Unity, 378.
Nilus, the Christian courtier in the desert, 327.
North British Review, 373.
Norwich, meeting at, 310.
Noual, Rev. John, two recovered works of, 340, 664, 730.

Obituary:
Andrews, Mr. Richard, 384.
Aspland, Mrs., 61.
Atkinson, Mrs., 191.
Aubrey, Mr. Richard, 317.
Barnes, Mr. C., 192, 255.
Baxter, Mr. Septimus, 384.
Bayley, Mr. John, 62.
Bennett, Mr. Thomas, 448.
Billett, Mr. S., 576.
Bishop, Mr. Thomas, 192.
Blake, Mrs., 639.
Boag, Mrs. 448.
Braham, Mr. Edward, 256.
Brock, Miss, 639.
Brocklehurst, Mr. William, 639.
Bromley, Mrs. 704.
Brookes, Mr. Joshua, 703.
Browne, William, Esq., 761.
Buckton, Mrs. Joshua, 64.
Checkley, Miss, 576.
Clark, Mr. Thomas, 448.
Cooper, Mrs., 61.
Cooper, Mr. Francis, 316.
Croft, Miss, 191.
Curtis, Mrs. Joseph, 192.
Curtis, Mrs. Stephen, 576.
Davison, Rev. David, 62.
Dawes, Miss M., 61.
Dawson, Miss, 384.
Dootson, Mrs., 447.
Dowson, Mr. Alfred Pendlebury, 191.
Duffield, Rev. W., 256.
Dunkin, Mr. J. H., 61.
Edwards, Rev. John, 254.
Ellis, Mrs., 704.
French, Mr. Edward, 191.
Furst, Captain, 448.
Gibbs, Miss Helena, 256.

Obituary:
Gibson, Mrs., 576.
Gosbell, Mr. Ebenezer, 192.
Greene, Mrs., 576.
Hall, Mrs., 191.
Ham, Miss, 704.
Hawkes, Mr. W. R., 447.
Heaviside, Mr. Thomas, 316.
Hervey, Mr. T. K., 256.
Hobson, Mr. William, 704.
Holland, Mrs., 704.
Hughes, Mrs., 384.
Hutton, Henry, Esq., 316.
Jevons, Mrs., 576.
Lang, Mr. Thomas, 190.
Manning, Mr. W. O., 191.
Martin, Miss Caroline, 192.
Millington, Mr. James, 61.
Millington, Mr. James, Jun., 61.
Mitchell, Miss, 639.
Moon, Mrs., 256.
Mott, Julius, Esq., 762.
Nash, Mrs. Mary, 191.
Netterville, Mr. J. E., 256.
Nichols, Dr. Ichabod, 319.
Nicholls, Mr. J. A., 639.
Oates, Mr. Joseph Henry, 640.
Pace, Mr. J. H., 576.
Powell, Mrs., 639.
Poynting, Mrs., 319.
Prentis, Miss Rose, 316.
Ralls, Miss, 192.
Randell, Mr. Worton, 64.
Randell, Mr. Dennis, 191.
Ryland, Mr. Thomas Edmund, 762.
Slaughter, Miss, 639.
Smethurst, Rev. John, 474.
Smith, Mr. David, 192.
Story, Mrs. Marabella, 200.
Suttill, Mr. John, 576.
Talbot, Miss Sarah, 576.
Taylor, Mr. Richard, 64.
Till, Mr. William, 761.
Turner, Rev. William, 318, 351, 410, 425, 454.
Wallace, Rev. Charles, 681.
Wansey, Mr. George, 191.
Watson, Mr. T. H., 576.
Whitehead, Rev. James, 192, 257.
Wiles, Mr. J., 256.
Wright, Mrs., 192.
Wrigley, Mr. Jeremiah, 191.
Ordination of Rev. W. Turner, 359—of Rev. J. Lloyd, 700.
Owen, Professor, on the advancement of science, 86, 129.

Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, 268.
Parker's, Theodore, Experience as a Minister, 755.
Patrick, Bishop, memoir of, 283.
Paul's conversion, 101, 270.
Paul's history, 266.
Paula and Jerome, 330.
Peabody's Christian Days and Thoughts, 244.
Perkins', Rev. F., bigotry at Dorchester, 58.
Platt chapel, history of, 277.
Portland-street chapel, proceedings at, 184.
Potter, Mr. Edmund, on Reform, 43. Address to students, 157.
Priestley's, Dr., letter to Davy, 306.
Prince of Wales at Rome, 128.
Proem of St. John's Gospel, 538.
Protestantism and Fine Arts, 1.
Provincial Meeting, Lancashire and Cheshire, 498.
Provincial Missionary Association, 756.
Prussia, King of, 253.
Puritans of England, 284.

Religion and theology, 245.
Resurrection, the, 244.
Resurrection of Christ, 577, 705.
Revised Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, 542.
Robbins's portrait of a Christian, 308.
Rogers, Samuel, Recollections by, 630. Mr. W. Sharpe's biographical account of, 630.
Ronge's Reform Communities of Germany, 98, 162, 220.
Ryland, Rev. J. H., on Atonement, 492.

Sadler's, Dr., Gloria Patri, 336.
Scargill, Rev. W. P., 70.
Science and religion, 86, 129, 623.
Seven Stormy Sundays, reviewed, 304.
Sharpe, Mr. Samuel, on the word Baptize, 41. On the chronology of Christ's ministry, 110. On the translation of Solomon's Song, 429. On Isaiah xi. 15, 16, 490. Prize at Carmarthen, 507. On the pillar of cloud and fire, 561.
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, Memorials of, 655.
Short, Rev. J. L., testimonial to, 187. Letter to the Western Unitarian Christian Union, 755.
Slavery in England and the laws relating to it, 721.
Smethurst, Rev. John, memoir of, 474.
Smith, John, of Cambridge, 287.
Smith, Rev. G. V., on Isaiah xi. 15, 16, 562.
Socinianism, pretended history of, 373.
Sonnet to truth, 18.
Southampton, corner-stone of Unitarian church, 566.
Southern Unitarian Society, 376.
Spirit music, 264.
Stanley's, Dr., Canterbury Sermons, 300.
Steinthal's, Rev. S. A., visit to Transylvania, 477, 530.
Stephensons, the, and Rev. Wm. Turner, 411.
Story, Mrs. Marabella, 200.

Sunday-schools and dramatic performances, 299.
Sunday-School Association, annual meeting of, 443.

Tagart, Rev. Edward, memoir of, 65. Published writings of, 233.
Talbot's, Mr. F., defence of Newbury trustees, 121.
Tayler's, Rev. J. J., address to students of Unitarian Home Missionary Board, 149. Sermon on English Nonconformity, reviewed, 177. Speech at Portland-Street chapel, 184. On Bunsen's account of Channing, 557. Address at the opening of the College session, 641. On the authorship of the Apocalypse, 741.
Taylor's, Isaac, Logic in Theology, reviewed, 321.
Taylor, Mr. Edgar, and the Unitarian Association, 616, 754.
Templar, Mr. Benjamin, on Secular Education, 180.
Theological phrases, 176.
Theology a science, 641.
Theophilus of the Acts, 108.
Thom's, Rev. J. H., Selection of Hymns, 45. Sermon on Religion and Theology, 245. Speech at Chester, 503, 564.
Three Heavenly Witnesses, the text of, 452.
Thrush, Captain Thomas, 21.
Turner, Rev. W., of Newcastle, 318, 351, 410, 425, 431, 454, 565.
Turner, Rev. W., of Wakefield, 353.
Transylvanian Unitarian churches, 78, 477, 530.
Trust, lines on, 239.
Truth, once popularized, safe, 335.
Tydd St. Giles's, Ely, 340.

Unitarian Association, anniversary of, 437. Its founders, 605, 616. Recommended, 702.
Unitarian missions projected, 188.
Unitarian convert's religious experience, 513.
Unitarian Minister on a National Reviewer, 577.
Unitarian Layman on a National Reviewer, 705.
Unitarian name and position, 603, 744, 747, 752.
Unitarian Home Missionary Board, 126, 149, 157, 187.
Unitarian effort, reasons for, 212.
Unitarian works, discovery of two unpublished, 340.
Unitarianism, in Australia, 188. In England, misrepresented by Isaac Taylor, 323. Misrepresented by the *Inquirer*, 335. A part of the true church of Christ, 518. Dr. Campbell's history of, 526. Of old Presbyterian societies, 648. In India, 695. At Stratford, 703.

Vatican MS. of the New Testament, 449.

Wakefield, Rev. Gilbert, 356.
Wallace, Rev. Robert, on the Acts, 102, 227.
Wallace, Rev. Charles, memoir of, 681.
Warrington Academy, 354.
Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society, 574.
Wellbeloved, Rev. Chas., memoir of, 19. Testimonial, 26. Works, 32. Translation of the Bible, 36. Portrait of, 59, 118, 447. Proposed Memoir of, 759. Memorial, 760.
West-of-England Book and Tract Society, 508.
Western Christian Union, 698.
Whitaker, Rev. John, of Platt, 282.
Whitehead, Rev. James, memoir of, 257.
Whitfield, Rev. E., on the Grandeur of Christ's Mission, 368.
Widows' Fund at Chester, 506.
Wigan, John, of Birch, 278.
Williams's, Dr., Glasgow students, 682.
Woods, Rev. J. C., Lecture on the Divinity of Christ, 247. On religion in Australia, 298, 575.
Worship-Street social meeting, 125.
Wrangham, Archdeacon, 21.
Wreford's, Rev. Dr., account of Mr. Tagart, 66.
Wright, Rev. John, testimonial to, 187. On Unitarianism and Unitarians, 752.

Yates, Mr. James, at Glasgow, 683.
York, city walls of, 19. Institute of Popular Science, 20. School for the Blind, 21.
Yorkshire Philosophical Society, 760.

C. Green, Printer, Hackney.

HR. 13. ctt

# HIBBERT TRUST.

## FOURTH REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES.

21st June, 1859.

The Trustees acting in pursuance of one of the regulations of the Trust have now to record such of their proceedings during the years 1857–9 as they deem to be of sufficient public interest.

The Examination for the year 1857 was held at University Hall on the 23rd, 24th, and 25th November, and resulted in the election, under the then existing regulations, of the only candidate, Mr. Blazeby, a student of Manchester New College, to a Probationership, which was relinquished by him in the autumn of 1858, upon his appointment as Assistant Minister of the congregation assembling in the High Pavement Chapel, Nottingham.

Three Scholarships were announced for competition in the year 1858, and three candidates, students of Manchester New College, originally sent in their names; but, on the advice of the Principal of the College, two of these gentlemen postponed offering themselves. The remaining candidate, Mr. Charles Barnes Upton, presented himself for examination on the 6th,

7th, and 8th December, 1858, and was subsequently elected to a Scholarship.

Mr. Robert B. Drummond, whose election as the first Scholar under the Trust in 1855 was noticed in the last Report of the Trustees, accepted, during the last half-year of his Scholarship, an invitation to become the Minister of the Unitarian Congregation at Edinburgh, and continues to hold that office. The Rev. Edwin Smith and Mr. James Drummond still hold the Scholarships to which they were elected in the year 1856. Mr. Smith graduated, at the commencement of the present month, as M.A., in the University of London, and, in accordance with a new regulation of the Trust, receives from the Trustees the sum of £50 in addition to his stipend, and he has this day been elected the first Fellow under the Trust: his Fellowship commencing on the expiration of his Scholarship. Mr. James Drummond will enter upon his pastoral duties as Minister of the Cross Street Chapel at Manchester in the course of the ensuing half-year, and the Scholarships of both these gentlemen will cease in December next.

The half-yearly Reports of all the Stipendiaries under the Trust during the past two years have been considered satisfactory by the Trustees.

The attention of the Trustees has been directed, during the past year, to the question whether the income of the Trust is liable to the payment of property-tax. They are now engaged in endeavours to obtain exemption from all payments of this duty, on the ground of the charitable nature of the Trust, and they have every reason to believe that they will ultimately be successful in effecting this object.

A Report of the Regulations of the Trust having become necessary, the Trustees have devoted much time to the re-consideration of the rules hitherto acted on, and a series of Regulations was finally agreed to in December last, which, whilst including the greater part of the Rules previously in force,

contains many amendments and additions founded on past experience. The following are the principal alterations which have been introduced:—All portions of the former Regulations which had reference to the granting of Probationerships have been rescinded, and no Candidate for examination will now be admitted to the benefits of the Trust unless his qualifications are such as to entitle him to a Scholarship.—The stipends of scholars have been increased with a view to induce them to retain their Scholarships for the full term, in preference to accepting invitations to become the ministers of congregations.—And the Trustees have, by a new Regulation, confirmed previous Resolutions to the effect that no part of the Trust funds shall be devoted towards the personal expenses of any Trustee incurred in attending the meetings of the Trust. Whilst the Regulations were under consideration, a proposal was brought forward for devoting part of the Trust funds to exhibitions of small amount for Candidates less advanced than those who would present themselves for Scholarships, but the Committee of Management, to whom the proposal was referred, expressed themselves adverse to the change, having been favoured with the opinions of the Rev. John James Tayler and the Rev. James Martineau on the subject, and the Trustees consider the letters of these gentlemen of such weight that they have not entertained the proposal further, and are glad to have obtained permission to publish extracts from both letters in the present Report. Mr. Tayler says:—

* * * * I think it very important to prevent the Hibbert Trust from degenerating into a source of aid to funds already in existence for enabling young men to enter on the studies of the Christian ministry. It is a question with some very sincere friends to a learned ministry, whether such funds are useful in any case, and really promote the end which they have in view. On this point I do not now offer any opinion; but to apply the Hibbert Trust to an increase of such funds would, I think, be clearly against the object of its founder. * * * *

The Trust, I think, will best fulfil its object, not by lending assistance to mere beginners, *but by limiting itself to the bestowal of marked distinctions, obtained after severe and thorough examination, on the most promising candidates for the ministry.* In this way it may become a means of establishing a higher standard of education among us, and of infusing a more varied mental culture into our ministry. Whether the present plan admits of some modification and development, in order more fully to attain that object, may be a question fairly open to consideration; but there can be no doubt, I think, that to that object, and that object alone, the attention of the Trustees should be directed.

Mr. Martineau after referring to discussions which arose more than twenty years ago in the Committee of Manchester New College, continues as follows:—

* * * * I then came to the conclusion, which I have since seen no reason to modify, that the *first steps* towards the Christian ministry should be taken mainly by the spontaneous and unaided zeal of the candidate and his friends; and that the help of public funds should first become accessible to him in recognition of proved capacity and promise, and after a decisive practical test of earnestness in the choice of his profession. I would, therefore, reserve all money grants for the later and graduate period of the divinity student's course, though, perhaps, not diminishing, on the whole, the amount he now receives. I am persuaded that the facilities at present given at the outset, have tempted, and, as long as they continue, will tempt into the ministry, young men not intrinsically fitted for its duties. It is vain to rely on an examination as a means of stopping them at the threshold; you want what no examination can give you, viz., an assurance as to their tone of mind and character, their personal energy and freshness, even their habitual mode of utterance and exterior address. The ordeal which would really be conclusive, is precisely what we should get from the candidate's struggle, on such resources as he could muster, through the difficulties of his first years. He would emerge from these years with the evidence of his earnestness upon him; and, meanwhile, his qualities and attainments would have become perfectly well known.

Should it even be thought hazardous to the supply of ministers

to carry out this principle at once, and to its full extent, I still think that any *changes* we may make should be in the direction of approach to it, not of further departure from it; I must confess, therefore, I should regret to see, reinforced by the influence of the Hibbert Trust, a system which needs rather revision than imitation.

To grants of money awarded, not to personal merit, but to professional neediness, a certain eleemosynary character will always attach. To fix this as a mark upon the Christian ministry is very undesirable, especially in a religious body which invests the clergy with no special sacerdotal sanctity (like the Catholics), but makes everything dependent on the *personal* attributes. The one great aim of those who would raise the character of the ministry in our churches, should be, in my opinion, to exclude, at all cost, any poor and feeble type of person, and encourage heartily all the higher qualities—practical, intellectual, and spiritual. The dribbling in of inferior men for a few years, fixes an artificial depreciation on the whole work of the ministry, and strips it of its natural force and interest, till only mediocrity will come near it. On the other hand, a score or so of vigorous, scholarly, efficient, and pious men, once brought into our pulpits, would lift up the whole profession, and cause it to be sought by quite a higher class of minds.

In order to apply a discriminative encouragement for this end, it plainly must be reserved till the character has developed itself; and must be understood from the first to be unattainable except on high conditions.

Two of the Trustees, Mr. Wrigley and Mr. Worthington, have retired from the Trust since the publication of the last Report. Thomas Ashton, Esq., of Ashfield, Manchester, has been elected as a Trustee, in the place of Mr. Wrigley, and the other vacancy will be filled up by the Trustees in December next. No other change has taken place in the offices of the Trust.

Before concluding their Report the Trustees have to notice an application from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association for the apportionment out of the Trust funds of an annual grant for the establishment of an Hungarian Scholarship. An extract from a Report of the Rev. S. A. Steinthal,

on his mission to Transylvania, was also forwarded by the Association. After considering the subject at their Meeting to-day the Trustees have directed their Secretary to inform the Association that in the opinion of the Meeting the Hibbert fund was founded to advance the education and position of the Antitrinitarian ministry of these Kingdoms only, but at the same time to state the desire of the Trustees to be of any service consistently with the constitution of their Trust.

The next Examination under the Trust has been fixed for the 21st, 22nd and 23rd November, when the Trustees have decided to award three Scholarships, provided that Candidates are declared to be duly qualified by the Examiners. The subjects of examination remain unchanged.

CHARLES J. MURCH, Secretary.

University Hall,
Gordon Square, London.

Woodfall and Kinder, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.